



# INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS AND THE ANTIQUITY OF INDIAN ARTIFICIAL POETRY

*By*  
G. BURLER



Department    Ancient Indian History and Culture  
University of Calcutta  
1970



Reprinted from the *Journal of Ancient Indian History*, Vol. II (1968-69) and Vol. III (1969-70) published by the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, University of Calcutta, 51/2, Hazra Road, Calcutta-19.

BCU3396

288506

## PREFACE

The celebrated German savant, G. Bühler, to whom the study of Indian epigraphy owes an extremely heavy debt, published a very valuable monograph entitled *Die Indischen Inschriften und das Alter der Indischen Kunstpoesie*. It was translated into English by V.S. Ghatge, and the translation appeared in the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XLII, 1913. We thought of reprinting the said translation in the pages of the *Journal of Ancient Indian History*, because it would greatly benefit the students of both epigraphy and the history of Sanskrit literature.

We have added some footnotes to the text, though the inaccuracies pointed out in some of them may be due to the printer or the translator and not to the author. To Bühler's superb treatment of the subject, we may add only two points. Firstly, the earliest Sanskrit inscription in *Kāvya* style, analysed by him, is the Junagadh inscription of the Śaka *Mahākṣatrapa* Rudradāman I, dated Śaka 72 (150 A. D.), while we have a few small epigraphic records containing Sanskrit stanzas in the Classical metres, and these belong to the age of the Śaka Satraps of Mathurā, who flourished about the beginning of the first century A. D. (cf. Editor's note at p. 83). Secondly, the only Prakrit inscription in *Kāvya* style, which has been analysed by Bühler, is the Nasik *prasthā* of the 19th regnal year of the Śatavāhana king Vasiṣṭhi-putra Pulumāyi (c. 130-59 A. D.), though the credit of being the earliest such Prakrit epigraph actually goes to the Hāthigumphā inscription of king Khāravēla of Kāliṅga, who flourished in the latter half of the first century B. C. This is a partly damaged record first noticed in the *Asiatic Researches*, Vol. XV, 1825, and many scholars have written on its text for more than a century between the first serious attempt at decipherment in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. VI, 1837, and the last in our *Select*





- *Inscriptions*, Vol. I, 1942 and 1965. Thus the beginning of *Kāvyo* literature may be pushed back a little further on the basis of epigraphic evidence than Bühler's examination of inscriptions suggested.

The index of the present volume has been prepared by Dr. S. P. Singh, a Junior Research Fellow at the Centre of Advanced Study in Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University, to whom our sincere thanks are due.

D. C. SIRCAR

Dept. of Ancient Indian History  
and Culture, Calcutta University,  
51/2, Hazra Road, Calcutta-19.  
December 1, 1969.

Carmichael Professor and Head  
of the Dept. of Ancient Indian  
History and Culture and Direc-  
tor of the Centre of Advanced  
Study in AIHC, Calcutta Uni-  
versity.

## Contents

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. Vatsabhaṭṭi's <i>Pratisthā</i>	9
III. Harīṣeṇa's Panegyric of Samudragupta	33
IV. Gīrnār Inscription of the Reign of <i>Mahākṣatrapa</i> Rudradāman	50
V. Nasik Inscription No. 18, dated in the Nineteenth Regnal Year of Śrī-Pulumāyi	63
VI. Conclusions and their Bearing on the Theory of Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature	76
INDEX	97

# INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS AND THE ANTIQUITY OF INDIAN ARTIFICIAL POETRY

## I

### *Introduction*

Indian epigraphy which, since the last fifteen years, has received a new impulse, and which, thanks to the progress of Sanskrit philology as well as to the perfection of the methods of getting inscriptions in large numbers, leads to more certain results than in earlier times, has already provided us with several important particulars of elucidating the literary and religious history of that part of the world which is inhabited by the Brâhmaṇas and which wants a history as such. On the one hand, we owe to it particular and very important data which definitely fix the time of prominent authors; as for instance, recently the time of the dramatic poet Rājasekhara, whose pupils and patrons, the kings Mahendrapāla and Mahīpāla ruled during the last decade of the ninth and in the beginning of the tenth century of the Christian era, as shown by Fleet and Kielhorn. On the other hand, the comparison of the partly insignificant notices in the inscriptions with the accounts of literary tradition or with the data or conditions of the present day, permits us to have an occasional peep into the development of all the types of literature and of all the religious systems, a peep whose worth is considerably significant in the absence of really historical details. Such,



for instance, is the observation that the tradition about the home of several Vedic Schools and also of the works belonging to them, is confirmed through the statements in the old land-grants, inasmuch as these mention not only the names of the donees but their secular and spiritual families. Not less significant for the history of the very important, though little regarded in earlier times, religion of Mahāvīra-Vardhamāna is the demonstration, gradually rendered feasible, that his followers, the Nirgranthas or Jainas, are mentioned in a number of inscriptions which run on from the beginning of the historical period of India, with but rare interruptions, and that the assertions in their canonical works, about the divisions of the Monks' Schools, are made reliable, to the most part, through writings of the first century of the Christian era. These hitherto published results are, however, only a small part of what the inscriptions may possibly yield to us. An accurate working out and a fuller estimate of the hitherto published materials, little in extent though they be, will show that one can procure valuable information from them, in all the departments of Indian research; and that their results furnish specially sound proofs for the theories about the development of Indian intellectual life, theories which the Indologists build on very weak foundations, compelled as they are by sheer necessity. This treatise is a small contribution towards the examination of inscriptions in this spirit. Its aim is to establish firmly those results which the inscriptions yield for the history of Indian *lāya* or the artificial poetry of the court, as also to demonstrate how far the same agree with the few opinions regarding the development of this species of literature. My reason for undertaking to treat this question, before other perhaps more interesting and less disputed questions, is the recent publication of the Gupta inscriptions by J. F. Fleet in the third volume of the *Corpus*



*Inscriptionum Indicarum.* This exceedingly important work offers a larger number of wholly or partly metrical inscriptions with absolutely certain dates. The same, taken together with some documents already made known through reliable publications or editions allow us to prove the existence of *kāvya* literature in Sanskrit and Prakrit during the first five centuries of our era, and to show that a great period of literature, which brought into general prominence the style of the poetic school of Vidarbha or Berar, lies before the middle of the fourth century A. D. They also make it very probable that the year 472 A.D. is to be fixed as the *terminus ad quem* for the poet Kālidāsa.

Such conclusions would, no doubt, appear quite unimportant and scarcely worth the trouble of a special inquiry to those searchers who busy themselves with the history and literature of the European peoples. The Indologist, however, is unfortunately not in that happy position to look down with contempt, even upon such general results. Because, the history proper of Indian Artificial Poetry begins not earlier than in the first half of the seventh century A.D., with the reign of the mighty king Harṣa or Harṣavardhana of Thanesar and Kanauj, who is known to have ruled over Northern India in 606-47 A. D. The works of his favourite court poet Bāṇa-bhaṭṭa, who tried to portray the life of his master and of himself in the incomplete historical novel *Harṣatarita*, and who besides wrote, as we know for certain, the romance *Kādambari* and the poem *Caṇḍīlata*, and perhaps also the drama *Pārvatīpariṇaya*, are the oldest products of the court-poetry whose composition, no doubt, falls within the narrow limits given above. Before this time, there exists no *kāvya* as such, whose age is hitherto determined with some accuracy and certainty or allows itself to be determined with the accessible documents. Only of one work which shows, throughout, the influence of the *kāvya*



style and which contains several sections entirely written in that style, we mean Varāhamihira's metrical Manual of Astrology, the *Bṛhat-saṃhitā*, it can be said with confidence that it is written about the middle of the sixth century, because Varāhamihira begins the calculations, in his *Pañcasiddhāntikā*, with the year 505 A. D., and he is supposed to have died in the year 587 A. D. according to the statement of one of the commentators. As to when the most celebrated classical poets Kālidāsa, Subandhu, Bhāravi, Pravarasena, Guṇāḍhya and the collector of verses Hāla or Śātavāhana lived, we possess no historical evidence. We can only say that the wide spread of their renown is attested for the first half of the seventh century by the mention of their names by Bāṇa and of Kālidāsa and Bhāravi in the Aihole-Meguti inscription of 634 A. D.; and some of them, like Guṇāḍhya, to whose work Subandhu alludes repeatedly, must certainly have belonged to a considerably early period. Besides this, there are anecdotes, only poorly attested, as well as sayings of very doubtful worth; and the scanty details contained in the poems themselves which might serve as stepping stones for determining their age, are very difficult to be estimated, because the political and literary history of India during the first five centuries of our era lies very much in obscurity. When the age of the most important poets is so absolutely uncertain, it is but natural that the case should be in no way better with the general question of the age of the *kāvya* poetry. In the literature, we come across very meagre traces which point to the fact that the artificial poetry was cultivated from earlier times; and to our great regret, even the age of the most important work in which quotations from *kāvya*s occur, we mean the *Mahābhārata*, is in no way above doubt. Thus it is not improbable that these quotations might be left unheeded as being witnesses little to be trusted as some of the most important inquirers



have already done and that theories, not taking notice of the same, might be put forth, which shift the growth of the artificial poetry to a very late age. Under these circumstances, it can be easily seen why I make myself bold to claim some interest for the evidence based upon the testimony of inscriptions, in favour of a relatively high antiquity of the artificial poetry.

The materials which the third volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* offers for this inquiry, are not insignificant, and comprise not less than 18 numbers whose dates are certain or at least approximately determinable, the age of their composition lying roughly between 350 and 550 A. D. The assiduous labours of Fleet and Dikshit, about the astronomically calculable dates of the Gupta inscriptions, irrefutably show that the beginning of the Gupta era falls 241 years later than that of the Saka era, and for the reduction of the Gupta to the Christian era they leave us just the option of adding 318 or 319 years. Fleet has tried to show that the year 319 or 320 A. D. marks the beginning of the Gupta era. R. G. Bhandarkar, on the other hand, advocates 318 or 319, and for important reasons. For a literary-historical inquiry, it is of course of little importance as to which of these suppositions is the right one. The first king who makes use of the Gupta era is Candragupta II, named Vikramāditya, whose inscriptions and coins show the years 82\*-94 or 95, i.e., 400-13 or 401-14 A. D. Of the reign of his father Samudragupta, there are two inscriptions, not dated. These belong to the latter half of the fourth century and, as regards Fleet's No. I, it can be asserted that it was composed when Samudragupta had already ruled for many years, because the number of his exploits eulogised therein is very consi-

---

\* [Now we have his Mathura inscription of the 5th regnal year and of the Gupta year 61 (*Sel. Ins.*, 1965, pp. 277 ff.—D.C.S.)



derable. Fleet's supposition that this inscription must have been composed after Samudragupta's death rests, as it will be shown in detail below, on a wrong interpretation of the expression "Samudragupta's glory had gone up to heaven". As for the documents dated according to the Muḥavya era, the detailed expositions of Peterson and Fleet leave no doubt that the era coincides with the Vikram era, or 318-57 B. C. The age of several undated documents can be determined, as Fleet has shown, by the comparison of their contents with those of the dated numbers. If we arrange chronologically the numbers important for our inquiry we may have the following list.—

1. No. I.—Harshav's preface to Samudragupta, composed sometime between 350 A. D.<sup>1</sup> on the Allahabad pillar—consisting of 9 verses and the rest in high, elevated prose, at the close named a *kāya*.

2. No. II.—Fragment of a poetic description of Samudragupta, composed sometime between 350-50 A. D.<sup>2</sup>

3. No. IV.—An undated fragment of a poetic description of four early Gupta kings, of the reign of Candragupta II, Guptaśaśivāt 42-44 (415-37).

4. No. VI.—The small, wholly metrical, undated inscription in Virūḥa's cave at Udayagiri, of the same period.

5. No. X.—The inscription on Dharmasarmān's pillar at Besāḍ composed partly in high prose and partly in metre—dated Guptaśaśivāt 35, i. e., 414 or 415 A. D., in the reign of Kuntaragupta, Guptaśaśivāt 61-62=414-15 to 431-32.

6. No. XVII.—The long composition, from Māyurdeśikā's well in Gaṇadār, dated Śaśvāt 420 (= 423-24) A. D., of the reign of Kuntaragupta, Guptaśaśivāt 64-65.

1. [350-6 A. D.—D. C. S.]

2. [Middle of the 4th century A. D.—D. C. S.]

7. No. LNI.—The small metrical inscription from Śaṅkara's cave at Udayagiri, dated Gupta-saṁvat 106 = 424 or 425 A. D.

8. No. XII.—The undated, partly metrical inscription on the pillar at Bihar, of the reign of Skandagupta, Gupta-saṁvat 261 D. i. e. 442 or 453-461 A. D.

9. No. XIII.—The undated inscription on the pillar at Bihar, which is partly in high prose and partly in metre, of the same period.

10. No. XIV.—The one, wholly metrical rock inscription at Jhamsaḍa, which is to the Gupta years 166 = 454-5 or 465-7 A. D. and is called a *śaṅka*.

11. No. XV.—The wholly metrical inscription on Madhav's pillar at Kāśmīra, dated Gupta-saṁvat 141 = 430 or 460 A. D.

12. No. XVIII.—A variable, wholly metrical *prasaḍa* about the Śiva temple at Mandinor, dated Maurya-saṁvat 529 = 473-74 A. D.

13. No. XIX.—The wholly metrical inscription on the pillar of Mahaveśu and Devaveśu at Iṣṭa, dated Gupta-saṁvat 165 = 453 or 484 A. D., of the reign of Bhaskaragupta.

14. No. XX.—The short, wholly metrical, inscription on Gopar's tomb-stone at Iṣṭa, dated Gupta-saṁvat 141 = 430 or 510 A. D., of the reign of Bhaskaragupta.

15. No. XXXIII.—A variable, undated, wholly metrical, *prasaḍa* of king Yaśodharman, on a pillar at Mānavaśvaka, spoken of as a *śaṅka*, and engraved by the same stone mason who inscribed the following dated inscription.

16. No. XXXV.—The wholly metrical *prasaḍa* on Daksas well at Mānavaśvaka, composed in the Maurya year 530 = 507 A. D., in the reign of king Yaśodharman or Varmārdhana.

17. No. XXXVI.—The inscription of Dharmavishnu's tomb-stone at Iṣṭa, of the year 2 of king Toramāṇa, composed partly in verse and partly in high prose.



11. No. XXXVII.—The wholly metrical panegyric on Matasya's temple at Vona in Gwalior, from the year 12 of the reign of Mihirakula who, according to No. XXXIII verse 6, was a contemporary of Yashodharman.

It would be perhaps possible to augment this list by the inclusion of some other documents, as for instance, the Mehrauli pillar inscription of emperor Candragupta No. XXVII and the partially coloured genealogy of the Alukharas on the Asirgarh wall No. XLVII which, according to the character of their writing, belong to this period. But those already mentioned quite suffice for our purpose. Their number shows that during the period 300-500 A.D., the use of the *lāṇā* style in inscriptions, especially in the lower ones, was in vogue, and from this very circumstance it follows that court poetry was zealously cultivated in India. It will be seen further on that this conclusion is confirmed by other indications of no doubtful character. Our next and most important task is, however, to enquire how far the samples of the *lāṇā* style contained in the inscriptions agree with the work of the recognized masters of Indian poetry and how the same are related to the rules in the manuals of poetics. A full discussion of all the numbers mentioned would in the meanwhile be too detailed and of but little use. It would suffice to select a poem that fully is the *lāṇā* of the period and another that belongs to the class in the same, as representatives, and to go through the same thoroughly. With the rest, only a few important points will be prominently touched upon. On these grounds, I take up, for purpose of a detailed discussion, No. I Harśana's panegyric of Samudragupta and No. XVIII Vatsyabhatt's poem on the Sun temple at Dasapura or Mandavor), and immediately turn myself to the latter.

## II

*Vatsabhatti's Praise*

Vatsabhatti's composition consists of 44 verses, not to mention the two 'blessings' or *mangala* as in prose form at the beginning and at the end. The whole can be divided into sections, as follows—

1. The *mangala* addressed to the Sun in verses 1-3 of which the first and the third belong to the type of what is technically called *ānā* or *ānāśā* blessings, while the second verse falls under the category of *namaskāra* or *namōstuta* (salutation).

2. A poetic description of the gold of the silk weavers of Dasapura-Mandaver, verses 4-22 in which description of their early fatherland Lata or Gujarāt, and of their later home Dasapura, are interwoven.

3. A poetic picture of the suzerain Kumbhagīpta, verse 23.

4. The name of his vassals Vasuvarmān and Bala-Varman, the rulers of Dasapura, verses 24-26.

5. A short description of the temple built by the weavers, verses 29-30.

6. The mention of the date of its construction with a poetic description of the winter season, when the temple was consecrated, verses 31-35.

7. A postscript narrating a restoration of the edifice demolished in parts, with a mention of the date of this event and a description of the season when it took place, verses 36-42.

8. A wish that the temple may last for ever, verse 43.

9. The name of the poet, verse 44.

If one compares these contents of the composition in question with the sample I have presented in *Revue de l'histoire de la littérature des Mémoires*, Vol. 11, pp. 46 ff., it will



It is seen clearly that the composition consists of two parts: a *prastāva* (anecdotes or panegyrics) of which the recent epigraphical researches have brought to light such a large number. The composition itself provides, as with a clear indication, that the poet wished to do his work aided by that name. For verse 44 says: "By the order of the king and owing to their devotion, was built this temple of the Sun, and the above was composed with great troubles," by Vatsabhatti."

The name *prastāva* is an expression which occurs frequently in later inscriptions of that type and which must be supplemented by the word *prastāva* as later Sanskrit remarks in the note to this verse. The fact that the entire title of the composition is not mentioned but is only indicated proves that in Vatsabhatti's time there were many such *prastāvas* and that it was a literary custom in the fifth century to compose the creation of temples and other edifices, the names of such occasional compositions.

Another interesting point in the foregoing verse is Vatsabhatti's assurance that he composed his work *prastāva* with a great effort.<sup>1</sup> By this he means to say, no doubt, that he utilized with all the best appliances and strove to observe very carefully the rules of poetics and metric. This careful study and this effort to do justice to the pretensions of the art of court poetry are to be marked in every verse. The very eagerness with which the author takes advantage of every little circumstance to bring in poetic details and descriptions, shows that he wished to do his best to make his composition resemble a *mahākāvya*. The science of that time prescribed that a *mahākāvya* should contain descriptions of cities, oceans, mountains, seasons and so on. Thus Vatsabhatti is not

<sup>1</sup> "With great care" (DC S).

dissuaded from devoting one verse (1 even to the early home of his patrons, the Lata country, casually mentioned as it is. The city of Dnyanara, of course, receives more space and is glorified in nine verses (6-14). The descriptions of the two seasons, of winter in verses 31-33 and of spring in verses 40-41, also find a place, i.e., to give the date completely, the month must be mentioned, and this naturally serves as an occasion for an exuberant use of the season in which the month falls. The examination of the metres used in Vatsabhata's 1st of his style would likewise show what great trouble he had taken, though, of course, the product is only of a mediocre type.

Next to proceed to the versification, there is a frequent change of the metres, which are sometimes very artificial. We have the following metres used—(1) *Indra* 4, 37, 41, (2) *Tryāṇ* 4, 1, 2, 33, 38-39, 41-42, (3) *Indra* 47, (4) *Upana* 10, 12, 123, (5) *Upana* 49, 24, (6) *Drata* 15, (7) *Alana* 20, (8) *Alana* 19, 43, (9) *Upana* 23, (10) *Upana* 3, 5-6, 1, 14, 15, 20, 22, 24, 27, 30-35, 40, (11) *Sāṅkha* 1-2, and 12, *Harig* 16. Of these, *Upana* is the most frequently used, i.e., in as many as thirteen verses. The frequent change of metre finds, without doubt, its explanation in nothing but the writer's desire to show his skill in the art, as otherwise the *pramāṇa* itself never demands it. In such compositions a single metre is used, with a second in the concluding verse. In fact, the *maṅgala* or *pramāṇa* preserving exact, similar phenomena. Sometimes we find that the whole of a *ka*-composition is in one metre, or a section of a *ka*-composition presents only one metre, sometimes there is one general metre with a different metre used at the close only. In other cases, again we see a large number of different metres used. One thing that is striking in Vatsabhata's versification is the frequent use of the weak pause which occurs in ten *Upana* verses, or two in *Upana*



and a one-*r*-*l* *śrī* verse (v). In the last case it stands at the end of a half-verse, where it is never found used by good poets, as far as I know. Vāṭsabhāṭṭa has thus made himself guilty of awkwardness. Other cases where the community offences against the rules of grammar or of rhetoric will be mentioned later on. As regards the form of the composition, it is to be further mentioned that often two or more verses form a *yugalaka*, a *viśeṣa* or a *kulśa*. *śrī* and *śrī* are illustrated in verses 21, 22 and *śrī* in verses 19, 20, 21, 26, 29, and *śrī* in verses 6-11, 31, 32, 33, 34. This peculiarity is also very frequently met with in all *śrī* and *śrī*.

Vāṭsabhāṭṭa's diction shows many marks which characterise, according to Dandin, the poets of the Eastern School. First of all, he makes use of long compounds, which cover a *pāda* or more than a *pāda* or even the whole of a *śrī* verse. Instances of the last type occur in verses 1, 4, 8, 14, 32, 33, while those of the first and second type are much more frequent. The whole of verse 33 consists of one single compound. If one compares Dandin's illustration of the style of the *Grāmāṭ*<sup>4</sup> with our verses 2-33, the resemblance would be unmistakable. Secondly, the writer in his attempt to bring the sound of the words into harmony with the sense, shows in one and the same verse a mixture of soft and hard sounding syllables, as is allowed only by the poets of Eastern India. Verse 26 runs thus—

*ta-r = at-a = śha-r = a-n-r = f-a-n-r*  
*ban-thu-pra-r = ba-r = a-pr-a-r = a-r*  
*ban-dh-r = a-r = ba-r = a-r = a-r = a-r = a-r*  
*da-r = d-r = pa-r = a-r = a-r = a-r = a-r*

'His son is king Bindhuvārman, endowed with firmness and statesmanship, dear to the brothers, a brother as it were,

<sup>4</sup> *Kūvyūdarśa*, I 52.

to his people, removing the sufferings of the relations, the only man skilful in destroying the proud hearts of enemies."<sup>5</sup>

Here, there is a change of the *rasa* or poetic sentiment. The first three *pādas* describe Bindhusarmān's wit and goodness, the last his terribleness in war with the enemy. Corresponding to this, the words in the first three quarters of the verse consist of syllables which are soft or light to be pronounced, in consideration of the necessity of the alliteration of the name Bindhusarmān. The fourth *pāda*, on the other hand, where the *raudra-rasa* prevails, contains only hard-sounding syllables and agrees quite well with Dānaka's typical illustration—

*nyakṣena kṣiptaḥ pakāḥ kṣatryācārāḥ kṣanūd = iti* <sup>6</sup>

While explaining *Samatā* or evenness of form required for the Vaidarhī *rati*, Dānaka in *utpāṭay*<sup>7</sup> the different types of letters which a verse can have and illustrates the same with examples. At the last example, he gives a half verse (19b) in which every *pāda* has a different combination of letters corresponding to the change of sentiment, and Dānaka further adds, in verse 50 that this sort of change or unevenness was in vogue only amongst the Easterners.

Of *śabdarāgākarat* or figures of words, Vatsiḥkṛiti uses only the *Anuprāsa* or alliteration. The letter-alliteration or *Varṇanuprāsa* occurs in every verse. The *Parānuprāsa* or repetition of the same word in different senses is found more seldom. The verse above 26, is an instance, where the word *bandhu* is repeated three in honour of the king Bindhusarmān. It is to be noticed that Kālidāsa in his brief accounts of the Rākhu kings Nabhas, Prādhika, Kṣemadharmān, Ahinaga and others, plays on their names

5 [Bandhu = friend.—D.C.S.]

6 *Kāvyaḍāraṇa*, I. 72.

7 *Ibid.*, I. 47-94a.

exactly in a similar manner'. In *prāśasti*, the sort of play on names is met with occasionally. One should specially compare the above-mentioned *Lakṣmaṇaśāla prāśasti*, wherein almost everything is provided with a play on the name. A second instance of the *Padānuṣṭāsa* occurs in the beginning of the first verse in *śāṭhaśa śāḍhy-śāṭhikāśa*, a third in verse 2 in *kinṇara naraśa*, a fourth in verse 18 where the first *pāda* ends with *raśāśa* and the second *pāda* begins with the same syllable, a fifth in verse 25 in *anāṭhanāṭhaśa*, and a sixth in verse 37 in *atyudāraṇa = udāraśa*.

Of the *Ālambāṇakara* or figures of sense, the author frequently uses only the most familiar ones, viz. *Upanāśa*, *Upekṣāśa*, and *Rūpaka* or the identification of two similar things. In the phrase *śāṭhaśa śāḍhy-śāṭhikāśa*, already mentioned above, a *Upekṣāṇāṭāśa* or Oxymoron appears to be attempted, and a *Dhṛṇi* (see below) is contained in verse 9. It would be little interesting to enumerate extensively the *Upanāśa*, *Upekṣāśa* and *Rūpakaśa* which the composition presents. Far more instructive would be the attempt to place the most important images and turns of expression side by side with similar ones in the *kāvya* and thus to show that quite a number of expressions characteristic of the *kāvya* style occur in Vatsyabhaṭṭa's *prāśasti*.

Even the praise of the Sun in the *vaṇaśāśa* contains several points of relationship with passages in classical poems which are devoted to the glorification of the same god. The first two strophes:

1. 'May the Light-giver (*Bhāskara*), the cause of the destruction and origin of the world protect you, the god, whom the host of gods worship, for purpose of their own preservation, the *Siddhas* the accomplished because they

8 *Raghuvamśa*, XVIII 5, 7, 8, 13 and so on (6, 8, 9, 14 according to the Narmada Nigantva ed.).



strive for further accomplishments, the *Devatās* entirely given to meditation, and having their objects of desire under their control, because they long for liberation, and the sages rich in severe penance, powerful through their cursing as well as favouring from deep devotion of the heart.<sup>1</sup>

2. "An adoration to the Generator *Savitr*, whom even the zealous Brāhmanas, knowing the truth, do not fully" comprehend, who supports the three worlds with his far reaching rays, whom the *Gandharvas*, gods, *Siddhas*, *Amaras* and men, praise as he rises, who tithes the levies of his devotees!"

compare briefly the ideas which are met with in the Purāṇas, in the writings of the Smṛaty, which identify the Sun with the world spirit, and even in still older works. Amongst the court poets there is one *Mokṣa*, in whose *Śrīmadāṭa*, a prayer addressed to the Sun, we have almost every one of the ideas contained in the verses above, repeated and with much the same form of expression. As *Natyaśāstra* perceives the Sun as being the generator and the destroyer of the world, so also *Mokṣa* identifies him, in verse 29, with Brahman, Viṣṇu and Śiva, the three gods who create, preserve and destroy the universe. As the *prāśasti* speaks of the worship of the Sun and of the prayer offered to him at dawn, so also does the *Śrīmadāṭa* frequently emphasise the idea that new spiritual beings where the Sun is the centre, only with this difference that the number of the divine and semi-divine beings, that long their adoration to the Sun, is much larger therein. In verse 15, the Sun's rays are praised by the seers amongst gods. According to verse 36, the lustre of the rising Sun is enhanced by the *Gandharvas* both in prose and verse,

1. Fleet takes *Arman* as an adjective of *deva-bhavam*.—D.C.S.]

as also by Nārada and other beings of antiquity. According to verse 31, prayers are offered to the Sun in the morning, by the *Siddhas*, gods, *Cāraṇas*, *Grandharta*s, *Nagas*, *Paṇḍhara*s, *Sāthya*s and princes amongst sages, by each in his own peculiar way. So also, the *Upaniṣad* often dwells on the thought that the Sun nourishes the gods and the world,—a thought already suggested by the Vedic name of the Sun-god, viz., *Pusan*—and that he make them free from the bonds of transmigration or re-birth. As for this latter point, verse 9 says of the Sun's rays that they are the boats which carry men through the fearful ocean of existence, the source of great sufferings. Further, the Sun's orb is described in verse 80, as 'the boat for the *Yogin* across the ocean of existence', and in verse 73, as 'the door of the liberated'. So also the Sun is depicted with special fulness as the nourisher of men and gods and as the maintainer of the entire order of the world (verse 67). The same thought is more briefly expressed in verse 77, where the Sun's orb is named 'the life principle of the world'. It may be added that in the older works of Vedic literature also we meet with the thoughts expressed in the beginning of our *prasa*na. Thus in the first verse of the *Itihāsaśloka*, the Sun is invoked as 'the generator of the world' and as 'the soul of the universe', and in the first verse of the *Upaniṣad* as 'the soul of embodied beings', and as 'the door of liberation'.

#### The third verse of the *maṅgala*

1. 'May the Illuminator (*Brāhma*) protect you, adorned with the beautiful ornaments of rays, the god whose circle of rays shines forth daily, coming over from the high, expansive summit of the mountain of the East, and who is lovely like the cheek of an intoxicated woman—  
com, rises the red-dish morning sun with the reddened cheeks of a drunk *Amra*. This comparison is quite characteristic



of the court poets who are never tired of describing or alluding to the revels of their heroes with their wives in the harem. Even in the *kāvya* literature this comparison is very often found used in connection with the rising as well as the setting sun of the day. Thus, for instance, Bana says in the beginning of a description of the evening: 'when the day went down, the day whose light became as soft as the cheek of a Mithila woman, reddened with the intoxication of wine,' etc. (*Harsha-rita*, p. 212). Bana's comparison is somewhat more nicely brought out than that of Vatsabhata, owing to the use of the term 'Mithila woman' in place of the general expression *amandāṇa*. The later poets make use of specific expressions, almost everywhere.

The following verses (480) describe the emigration of the silk-weavers from Lāta, the middle Gujarat, to Dasapura, wherewith short descriptions of Lāta and of the environs of the city are interwoven. These do not rise above the level of mediocrity and have nothing remarkable. Of course Dasapura, as we commonly see the cities described in the *kāvya*, is called the beauty-mark (*chāta*) on the forehead of the province, and this province also, which is named *chāta*, the earth, is imagined to be a female. As ordinarily, the trees bending under the burden of flowers are spoken of as her ear-crest, and the thousands of mountains, as her ornaments. So also as befits the *kāvya* style, the mountains are spoken of as tracking with the juice flowing from the temples of wild elephants.

The same remark also applies to the following verses (799) in which further the lakes and gardens of Dasapura are spoken of. The description contains only the most usual expressions that are found used in *kāvya* in a similar connection. The lakes are full of blooming water-lilies, and lively with ducks and swans. The water near their banks is variegated with the flowers fallen from the trees. The swans therein are





tawny-brown owing to the pollen fallen from the lotuses shaken by the lake waves. The trees bending under the burden of their flowers, the humming of the bees fed with the intoxication of honey and the incessant singing of the city-women waking for pleasure, make the groves lovely. It is to be noticed here that the description of the bees no doubt reminds us, through *dhruv*, of the bold and intoxicated lovers of the beautiful women. The following verse, on the other hand, which begins the description of the city is considerably more interesting.

19. Where the houses towering high, of the purest whiteness, with flying flags and trim women, quite resemble the peaks of silvery clouds variegated with flashes of lightning.

Vatsabhatta has given himself great pains to bring out the best possible resemblance between the houses and the clouds and thus to excel the parallel frequently used in the *kāvya*. This fact is specially proved by the double application of the word 'lightning flash'. He is not merely content with describing the lightning flash as the mistress of the cloud, dancing before the house for a moment, as Indian poets do very often, but he portrays the scene as the gay flags waving over the houses. There can be little doubt that Vatsabhatta intended in this to surpass some poet known to him, and we can hardly help thinking that he had before him the description of the palaces in Alaka, which Kalidasa gives in the beginning of the *Aparameśa* in the *Meghadūta*. The verse runs thus—

*Uttatantam talita anilāḥ s-rodita apam-īa-itrā*  
*can-ītāya prabhata-murapāḥ smigdhā pambhīra ghnam*  
*antāḥ loṣaḥ manomaya-bhūcas = tun-am = abhiraṇṇib-ōcrāḥ*  
*prajāṇāḥ = t-āṇ-īa-ītam = alar-yatra tāḥ = tarh-īreṣaḥ*

'Where the palaces can match themselves with you the cloud—by means of these and other particulars—their lovely,



fair inhabitants resemble your lightnings, their gaily coloured portraits, your rainbow, their drums struck for concert, your lovely, deep thunder, their jeweled floors, the shimmering drops of water that you lade, their terraces towering up to the clouds, your height.'

In the view that Vatsabhatti tried to compete with Kālidāsa, we are still further confirmed, if we observe that in the next verse he adds all the details met with in Kālidāsa, which are left out in verse 10. In that verse, he says

11 'And where] other [houses] resemble the high summits of the Kālidāsa, with long terraces and stour seats, resounding with the noise of music, covered with gay pictures, and adorned with rows of waving plantain trees.'

The agreement of thought and in every is thus quite complete. Only, Vatsabhatti says something more, and it is what we expect of an imitator and a rival. It goes without question that Vatsabhatti's verses are on a lower level than those of his model.

The next verse also, in which the description of the houses is further elaborated quite in an imitated manner, presents one point worthy of notice.

12 'Where the houses adorned with rows of stories, resembling gods' palaces, of pure lustre like the rays of the full-moon, raise themselves up, having torn open the earth.'

Here, the statement that 'the houses raised themselves up, breaking through the earth' is quite striking. If this expression means anything, it suggests a comparison of the houses with something to be found in the deep or the nether world, with something like the thousand white shining heads of Śeṣa. Such an image is, however, defective, when there is already a comparison of the houses with the *vimānas*, the moving gods' palaces, soaring up high in the sky. The difficulty, I think may be solved by supposing that Vatsa-



bhāṭṭa has confounded, with little understanding, two comparisons used by the poets of his time. The comparison of houses with the *amānas* of gods is not rarely found in epic works, but is still more frequently met with in the *kāvya*. On the other hand, that of buildings with things in the nether world comes only as now and then in artificial poetry. Thus in Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṃśa*, XII. 20, we have—

*sa cetanā-bandha-ānā a-platavāt = trāṇ-ānāḥ*  
*rasātālāt = i = omā, nāḥ* *Se an-itaṇaya Śaṇ-vaḥ ||*

The Rāvaṇa had a bridge built by the monkeys on the salt ocean, the bridge which was, as it were, the serpent Śeṣa, coming up out of the nether world, to serve as a bed for Viṣṇu.\*

So also in Mādhava's *Śatpātācchā*, III. 33, we have

*sa thye sarvadāt kakūḥaḥ pīṇaḥ =*  
*yā kuraṭī kūṇcaṇa-vaprabhāṣā |*  
*turaṅga-kāntā mukha-haya-rāḥ =*  
*jvāl = eva bhīṣā jālam = allolā =*

'In the midst of the ocean, shining with yellow-red, the towers with the lustre of its golden ramparts, the city (Dvārakā) shone forth like the flame of fire from the mouth of the mares, breaking up through the waters.'

It can be further seen that Vatsyabhaṭṭa, in spite of the great labours he has undertaken for his poem, has committed several offences against good taste, and thus we would not be unjust to him, if we suppose that, in this case, in his eagerness to bring in many figures of speech, he was tempted to confound in quite an unintelligible manner, two comparisons current in the literature of his time.

Not less interesting is the following verse of the *prajāpati*—

14. 'Surrounded by two churning rivers of tremulous waves, the city resembles the body of the God of Love, which



[his wives] Prīti and Rati with prominent breasts, embrace in secrecy.'

The idea of the rivers looking upon a females is a very natural one. It is very frequently met with in the *kāvya*. Thus Subhāṣhu in his *Latāvatī* p. 10—lines 1—5 says of the Vindhya mountain: *Revā prātanay = e = prā ātā = a - kantay = oṣa - dham*. It is surrounded by the Revā Narmadā as by a beloved with the arms in the form of ways stretched forth. Even a more exact parallel we have in a passage alike referring to the Vindhya and the above mentioned hymn of Agastya: *Bhāt arh ta* XII 1

*rahasi nalanā a taya Revā kantay = a = oṣa - dham*  
'whom the Revā embraces like an ardent beloved. Even though it may not be certain that Vāṭabhatī lived before Vāṭabhadra, one would be tempted to connect a close connection between his verse and that of the *Bhāt arh ta*. The real fact seems to be that all the three poets imitated some well-known model.

In the last verse a connection with the description of the city, we meet with a simile which is rarer.

14. 'With its Brāhmanas who are conspicuous with truthfulness, self-control, mental quietude, the observance of their vows, purity, brightness, the study of the Vedas, pure conduct, modesty and understanding, and possess no other treasures than knowledge and penance and yet are free from pride shines forth this city. Like the sky with its most rare of bright, glowing planets. Nothing greater to say, of the old *kāvya* literature is known to me. Of the other I find in many works and in the *prastāva*, we often see conspicuous persons compared to the Moon or the Sun, and their family to the heavens. In a later work the *Prabodha - rāto* 'The Life of Hemacandra' p. 54 there is found the comparison of a poet with the planet Mercury (Bulley).

In the following description of the cowl of a k-weaver,

which possesses more of historical than of poetical worth, there are, on the one hand several poetical expressions, and, on the other hand, some general assertions, which are quite characteristic of the *Kāvya* style. Thus in verse 15, we have the narrative use of the verb *prabh* in the phrase *abhratāḥ prā-śabdhātā-ānubhāḥ* 'whose friendship augmented more and more everyday'. So also the compound *śatāṇa-śubhaga*, 'pleasing to the ear' (verse 16), should be compared with *netra-śubhaga*, 'pleasing to the eye' (verse 21), and *pratāpa-śubhaga*, 'pleasing on account of wealth' (verse 31). *Śubhaga* is particularly used by Kālidāsa very often in the sense of 'delicious, lovely, pleasing' at the end of a couplet and words. Other poets also use the word *śubhaga* though more rarely. Further, we must notice the second half of verse 17

*ady = āpi c = ānye samāra-pragalbhāḥ*

*kat-adya = arā-ān = abhāḥ = prā-śabdhātā*

'And even today, others, contravening in war, effect by force the destruction of their enemies'. Here the wording which expresses the simple fact that some members of the weaver-caste served as soldiers is exactly as it is required in artificial poetry, and the words *samāra-pragalbhāḥ*, and *prā-śabdhātā*, of which latter the poet too also is to be observed, are quite characteristic of artificial poetry.

With verse 23, begins the description of the princes of Dasapura and their succession, where, at the very threshold we are face to face with quite a rash of images and turns of expression very frequently used by artificial poets.

23. 'While Kuṣāragupta ruled over the earth, which is circumscribed by the four oceans as by a moving girdle, whose high breasts the mountains Sumeru and Kailāsa are, and which smoothes with the flowers in full bloom coming from the woods.'

24. 'King Visvavarṇa was the protector [of Dvāpura], who is equal to Sukra and Bṛhaspati in wisdom [and] is the ornament of the king on this earth performed exploits in the battles, like Partha.

The metaphor of the girdle and the breasts of the earth is absent from all Indian poetry. The only thing to be noted in our passage is that Vātsyābhāṣa selects for the comparison the most important rhetorical ornaments. Probably, the *Haravast* and *Vindhyas* which are otherwise frequently referred to in this connection appeared too trivial to him, not to mention his desire to surpass his predecessors. The third metaphor of the *maṇḍala* in the form of flowers is also not a rare one. So also the compound *saṃudr-ānta* and *van-ānta* are quite characteristic in them: the word *ānta* has, really speaking, no meaning. The word *van-ānta*, as the passages quoted in the great *Petersburg Lexicon* show, is very frequently used in the sense of 'forest-region, forest' in the epics as well as in *kāvya* literature. *Saṃudr-ānta*, on the other hand, signifies only 'coast-land' in other places. But this sense would not do in the present case. For the shores are really included in the earth, and it is only the *ocean* that can suitably be represented as the swimming, moving girdle. Thus on the analogy of *van-ānta*, *saṃudr-ānta* appears to be used in the sense of 'the surface of the ocean', and it is very probable that the compound is used only for the exigency of the metre.

Equally noteworthy is the figurative use of the word *vaṇṭa*, so favourite with the court poets, which Dr. Bühnemann notes in the *Āśvafāṭa* I, 95-97, and variations as *atavardanam*. Of the comparisons in verse 24, that of the king with Partha or Arjuna is very familiar: so also is the comparison with Sukra and Bṛhaspati, the teachers and Puruṣottama of the Asuras and the gods respectively. In the second verse



referring to *Nisavayam* in verse 2 — the comparison of the king with the Tree of Paradise, yielding all the desires, stands out prominently, a comparison which the needy poets, as is well known, apply very frequently to kings in order to stimulate their generosity. Verse 26 with which begins the description of *Br. Tū amra* has been discussed above. In the following verse there occurs the stereotyped comparison with the God of Love, which the poet has taken trouble to make even more explicit by the use of several epithets.

27. . . . . of a . . . exceed form, . . . he shines forth, though not wearing ornaments by virtue of his beauty, as if he is the second God of Love.<sup>7</sup>

Then the next verse contains a description of the terrible character of the king, very frequently recurring in the *kāvyas*:

28. . . . . Even today, when the beautiful long-eyed wives of his enemies, elected as they are by these pangs of widowhood, remember him, a painful voice of frenzied laments their breasts. With this may be compared, for instance, *Rāmāyaṇa*, IV. 63, *Naladharma* Nos. 2102, 2105. Still more frequently are the pines of the ways of the enemies described in the *pramāṇa*, with various modes of expression.

As for the description of the temple, it is naturally verse 30, resembling a mountain, 'white like the pure rays of the moon that has risen up, and quite comparable to a lovely jewel on the crest of the western city'. After the restoration of the temple it is said in verse 31 to be 'touching the sky as it were, with its beautiful towers, and the receptacle of the pathless rays of the sun and the moon, at their rise, rise, reflecting their rays'. At last in verse 42, the poet assures us—

7 As the heaven with the moon, and the bosom of

10. Literary incarnation of sexual love.



Sarang with the *kanakada* jewel shines in pure lustre<sup>11</sup> so does the whole of the stately city embellished with this host of temple. The simile and mode of expression occurring in these verses are believed to be the repertory of the artificial poets.

The last points of an inscription, which deserve special attention, are the quotations of the two verses. Of these, that of the water in the *kulera* formed by verses 31-3 runs thus—

31. 'In the season wherein the houses are full of beautiful women which is pleasant on account of the azure rays of the Sun, and the warmth of fire, when the fish conceal themselves deep under water, when the rain is for Monsoon, the top floors of houses, studded with precious jewels and pearl necklaces afford no enjoyment when the heat first burns down the water-lilies.'

32. 'In the season, which is made lively by the swarms of bees rejoiced by the grace of the *chandra* flowers of the *roshra*, the *prishatara* tree and the jasmintree, when the solitary branches of the *lata* and the *naaga*, dance under the force of the cold wind free of frost,

33. 'When the young men counteract the effects of frost and snowfall, by first embracing the *chandra* thighs, the lovely breasts and the bumpy tops of their *chandra* breasts.'

34. 'When four hundred and ninety-three years had passed, according to the reckoning of the Mahayana in the season when one should derive pleasure from the high breast of women.'

35. 'On the auspicious thirteenth day of the bright half of the month of Shravana was this temple consecrated with the ceremony of auspicious benediction.

11. Fleet takes *kanakada* as an adjective of *nabha*.—Dr. S.







with verse 32, it must be added that 'the dancing of the branches or the creeper owing to the wind' is a favourite idea in the *Āṣṭa*—an idea which is sometimes found very much elaborated. Thus in the *Āṣṭa* (XV 14, 7, we have an elaborate description of the creeper as dancing women of the woods, with this we may also compare Kaṭṭaka's *Vikramorvashī*, Act II verse 4. The description of the spring, which comes in connection with the statement that the restoration of the temple was accomplished in the month of Tīpasa or Phālgua (February-March), is shorter in length and presents fewer characteristic features—

10. 'In the season, when the arrows of the god whose body is purified by Hara, increase in their might as they verily become one with the visible flesh, lowering blossoms of the *aśoka*, the *śatuka*, the *ambūka* the moving, *atimukta* creeper and the *madāyantikā*.'

11. 'In the season, when the whitest, large branches of the *nagana* are resounding with the noise of the swarm of bees delighted by the drink of honey, when the lovely exuberant *rodhira* is thickly set with flowers newly bursting forth.'

The most noteworthy point here is the identification of the five kinds of flowers with the five arrows of the God of Love. This idea is frequently met with in the *Āṣṭa*, and still more prominent is the fact that the spring is described as making ready the weapons for Kāma.

Thus in the *Āṣṭa* (XIII 27) we have—

*sadyah-pravāl-odgama-cāru-patre*  
*nīle samāptim nara-cūṭa-bāṇe |*  
*mācayamasa Madhur = dīp-ef'ān =*  
*nanak arān = aśa Manohara, aśa*

As the arrow of the fresh mango blossom, with tender sprouts serving as feathers, was white, pure reds Madhu

set therein the 'ark' bees which wear as it were the letters of the name of the God of Love.'

The same thought is more simply expressed in the verse quoted by Anantavardhana in the *Ānandashloka*, II. 23 f. 100 of the text in the *Ānandavibhāṣā* and in the *śaṅkhaśloka*, etc. No other flowers of the forest, however, do not wholly agree with those which, according to the *śaṅkhaśloka* are supposed to form the tips of the arrows of Kāma. Probably the author has intentionally chosen other names because he replaced the beginning of the spring in the coming part of the Śrī or the cold season whose four months Iqṣvaṇa or Haraṇa.

What we have said so far is sufficient to establish the fact that Vatsabandhu was acquainted with the needs of Indian poetry and that he tried to satisfy the demands thereof so that his *śloka*, in form as well as in sense, strictly belongs to the domain of Sanskrit official compositions. From this we can further deduce, without hesitation, the conclusion that in his time there existed a considerably larger number of *śloka* from whose study he cultivated himself upon which he drew and with which he tried to compete now and then. The reliability of this supposition is confirmed by many circumstances. Thus, Vatsabandhu was not at all a man to whom we can give the credit of originality, nor can we name him as a poet generally capable of giving new ideas. He shows the several weaknesses which characterize the poets of the second or third class who compile their verse carelessly after the model of the great Classical poets. A number of points which can illustrate this, have been already discussed above, and can be still further multiplied. Thus he uses expletives and particles not rarely, and never mends the fault of cataloguing, just in order to complete his verse. To the first category belong *pradānam* verse 5, *śameta* verses 5 and 17, *śata* = *śa* verse 27. The *śloka*s mentioned also in *anandashloka* (verse

23, and *tū-ānta* verse 7, so also the altogether meaningless prefixes *prati* and *abhi* in *pratibhāti* verse 3 and *abhibhāti* (verse 14). Likewise we meet with quite striking tautologies, e. g. in *bhānānāra parāś* (verse 4), where however, the synonymous words *anāra* and *parā* may perhaps be supposed to be put together in order to make the idea of the complete merging clearer and more emphatic, but, in *tul-īpamānāni* (verse 10), it is very doubtful even to find an appearance of excuse for the simultaneous use of the two synonymous words. Further, Vatsabhatti commits offences against grammar, for purposes of metre. A slight mistake of the kind is the use of the *Itmaripada* in *matasanta* verse 1, instead of the *Para-ripada* though this may perhaps be excused owing to its metrical use in epic poetry and on the ground of analogous mistakes met with in the *śālo*. Far worse, however, is the use of the masculine form *īpamāna* instead of the neuter *īpamāna* (verse 31), which has to agree with the substantive *īham* (verse 7). Fleet of course proposes to write *īpamāna*, but it would not at all suit the metre. Besides, with this alteration, the whole construction would not only be changed, but broken up into pieces because then the locatives in verses 30-31 would be altogether harmonious in the text. With the text as we have it, *īpamāna* 'was repaired' (verse 3), is the verb in the principal sentence with which, all the following words, which are attributes of the time, can be quite rightly connected. If, however, we write *īpamāna*, this used, then, becomes the principal verb and thus we must translate the stanzas as follow :—

37. 'This temple of the Sun, which the generous could caused to be built up again, in all its parts, very stately in order to further their renown,'

38. 'That temple, which was exceedingly high, glowing white the resting place of the pure rays of the Sun and



the Moon at their rise, touched, as it were the sky, with its charming turrets.\*

Here the sentence is complete, and there is no verb with which the following words 'after five hundred and twenty-nine years had passed, on the second day of the bright half of the lovely month of Tapasya' can be construed. That Vatsabhatti cannot be freed from the charge of having used a wrong gender, out of regard for the metre. We may suppose that he might have been conscious of the fault, but that he might have consoled himself with the beautiful principle

*mā an aṣṭaśatāḥ kuryād-ācitta-bhāvanā cū arjayet,*

according to which the correctness of the metrical form precedes every other consideration.

We can easily believe him as capable of such blunders, for in the second half of verse 30—

*yaś-śubhāḥ paśyāma purāṇa nūṇa kūṭa-  
cūḍāṇaḥ prathamaḥ nayan-abhāṇaḥ*

we come across something worse, a fault in construction. The genitive *paśyāma purāṇa* goes with *nūṇa*, and there is no substantive which is connected with *nūṇa*. The grammatically correct form should have been *paśyāma-paśa*, but that would not have suited the metre. To the category of poetical abstractions, not specially alleged, belong verses 7 ff., where it first *varāṇa* 'the likes', in general, is used, then again *śaśa* *varāṇa*, 'the likes in some places', is used. Further in verses 10-12, the poet first speaks of *gṛhaṇa*, 'the houses', then again of *anyāṇa*, 'other houses', and lastly again of *gṛhāṇa*, 'the houses', in general.

Notwithstanding all these facts, it cannot be denied that Vatsabhatti was a versifier perhaps learned, but

\*[See Vol. I, p. 30, note 3 (correction) — DCS]

clumsy and little gifted. This conclusion appears in no way surprising, if we remember that he never lived at the court of his native place Disapura but was a man of limited means or of moderate circumstances. If Vatsabhatti would have been able to boast of a place at the court of Bardhuvvarman or even of a mere connection with him, he would not have failed to let posterity know of the same or at least to praise his master as a patron of poetry. As nothing like this is done by him, we would not be wrong in supposing that he was a private man of learning, of the type found in all Indian cities, that he had specially studied the worldly lore and that he was not ashamed of making money by composing a piece of poetry occasionally even when such a low class of people as the silk-weavers required his services.

Thus it is quite evident that the points of affinity with the Classical literature, which are presented by a composition originating from such a man as Vatsabhatti are possessed of great significance. When we know that Vatsabhatti was not an original genius, but only a man who sought, with great effort in the sweat of his brow, to compile a medley of the Classical modes of expression and exerted himself, though with little success, to play variations on the same or to improve upon them, then the supposition cannot be gained that, in the fifth century, there existed a *kāvya* literature quite similar to that known to us already. This conclusion is still further confirmed by the fact that all the above *pralambas* in Fleet's volume which were composed between the year 400 and the year of Vatsabhatti's composition, present the same close relations to the *kāvya* known to us. We agree that a large number of these is no doubt of an insignificant character, and is written by private men, of learning of the province, as, for instance, the Disapura private, but there still remains the



conquered the province of Malwa in the middle of the Gupta year 82, i.e., 400-01 or 401-02 A.D. Thus the invasion, in which Virasena accompanied his master, could be undertaken not later than (but rather earlier) in the beginning of the year mentioned above. At this time, Virasena, as the verses above state, was the minister of foreign affairs. That a minister occupied himself with poetry leads us to conjecture that Candragupta II Vikramāditya looked upon the Muses with favour or that poetry had at least the right to appear at Court.

### III

#### *Harisena's Panegyric on Samudragupta*

The second of the inscriptions which we are going to examine, Harisena's panegyric of Samudragupta, presents many points of close touch with the *kāvya* literature preserved and proves in the clearest manner that court poetry was a subject most assiduously cultivated in the fourth century A.D. Harisena's panegyric covered originally thirty lines and a half, and consisted of eight verses in the beginning, a long prose passage and a concluding verse. All the three parts together form one single gigantic sentence. Unfortunately, the four lines in the beginning containing two verses have been entirely lost and lines 4-16 have been distorted more or less, so that we have only one of the introductory verses, in a complete form. The subscription of the author in lines 31-33 informs us that not only the metrical lines but the whole of the composition is to be regarded as *kāvya*. It is said there—

'And may this *kāvya*, of the slave of the feet of this same lord,<sup>1</sup> whose intelligence was expanded by the favour of

<sup>1</sup> i.e. of the king Samudragupta. Fleet's supposition that Candragupta II is meant is grammatically not allowable.



dwelling near [His Majesty], the minister of foreign affairs, and the counsellor of the royal prince,<sup>2</sup> the great General Harisena, the son of the *Ahalyatapakita*<sup>3</sup> and the great General Dhruvabhūti, lead to the welfare and happiness of all beings. The accomplishment of the same was, however, looked after<sup>4</sup> by the great General Tlabhattaka who meditates with reverence on the feet of his lord.<sup>5</sup>

Thus, this little composition of Harisena belongs to the class of mixed compositions which, in poetics, are frequently called by the name *campu*, while the oldest works preserved for us, such as the *Lāsaradatta Kadambari*, *Harimayita* and *Dakṣamārcutita* are called by the name of *ābhāṣikā* or *kathā*, 'a narration, a romance'. It possesses a certain relationship with the descriptions of kings which are found in the *ākṣāṇikās*. Similar to these<sup>6</sup> last, the description, in the present case, consists of one sentence

2. The title *Kumaramatya* 'counsellor or minister of the royal prince' corresponds probably to the title at present in use in Caurāt or *Ahmadnagar* *Karbhari*, the manager of the prince. In all the great courts in Kathiawad and Rāputānā the adult princes as well as the Chief Queens have their own *karbhari* who look after their private affairs. The minister of an Andhra queen is mentioned in the Kanheri inscription No. 1 (Arch. Surv. Rep. 4 Ind. Vol. V, p. 28). (*Kumaramatya* seems to be an *Amratya* enjoying the status of a *Kumara*. DCS.)

3. I take this word to be a title which, however, I am not able to explain. [The correct designation seems to be *Ahalyakutapakita*. DCS.]

4. The expression *anvathitam* will signify that Tlabhattaka who, as his title and name show, was a Brahmana of a high military rank, superintended the preparation of the fair copy and the engraving of the text at the use of the word at the end of the Caurāt inscription of Rudradāman discussed below.

5. See for instance *Kādambari* ed. Peterson, pp. 54, 53-56, *Harimayita* Kashmir ed. pp. 162-79, 227-28, 267-71 and especially *Lāsaradatta* ed. Hall, pp. 321 where in the midst of prose four verses have been interwoven.

with many adjectival as well as appositional phrases and a number of relative sentences. As will be shown later on, there are many agreements in respect of details. But, besides, Harisena's composition presents its peculiarity or special character in several respects. This comes out in the grouping of the elements and especially in the skill in bringing out a connection of the praise of Samudragupta with the pillar on which the inscription has been worked out. The last part which forms the very foundation for the compilation of the whole work, and the concluding verse, deserve a detailed examination not only for this reason, but also for the fact, which will be seen if they are rightly understood, that the inscription was not composed, as Fleet assumes, after the death of Samudragupta. They are to be translated in the following manner, according to my interpretation—

Lines 30-31—'This high pillar is as it were, the arm of the earth raised up, which announces that the fame of Samudragupta, the illustrious lord of great kings, greatly augmented through the conquest of the whole earth, filled the whole surface of the earth, and found a lovely, happy path in that it wandered from this world to the place of the lord of gods.\*'

Verse 9—'And the glory of this [ruler] which rises up

---

6 For the sake of comparison I give Fleet's translation of this passage which differs from mine. This lofty column is as it were an arm of the earth proclaiming the fame—which having pervaded the entire surface of the earth with [its] development that was caused by [his] conquest of the whole world [has departed] hence [and now] experiences the sweet happiness attained by [his] having gone to the abode of [Indra] the lord of the gods—of the *Ataharadithana*, the glorious Samudragupta. The points requiring explanation are (1) the addition of *has departed* and *and now* (2) the translation of *vicitram* by *experiences* and (3) the inversion of *ha* (i.e. of the king) before *having gone*.



in layers one above the other, through his generosity, his bravery of the arm, his self control, and his perfection in the science of letters, and which follows more than one path, purifies the three worlds, like the white waters of the Ganga, which rises up in even higher floods, follows more than one path, and dashes forth rapidly freed as it is from the imprisonment in the inner hollow of the braid of hair of Paśupati.'

For the explanation of this translation, the following should be noticed.

1. The word *ucchrita* (line 30) refers to the arm as well as the pillar, for it is only the raised arm pointing to heaven that can announce the fact that the king's glory has gone up there. The poet here has the *lopa* or *paranomasia* in view, and the word is, therefore, to be translated twofold. It is possible that the word *ucchrita* as taken with the pillar may mean 'erected (just here)' instead of 'high', but to decide which of the two meanings is intended we must know further particulars regarding the composition of the inscription.

2. As regards the translation of the word *cīratana* by 'path', it is to be observed that the synonymous *caraṇa*, *gamana* and *gama* are given in this sense in the Petersburg lexicon, and that this sense is justified by the statements of the grammarians about the suffix *ana*. According to them, the suffix *ana* serves to denote the means, and the path is, according to the Indian conception, one of 'the means of going'.

3. The adjectival phrases *uparūpari-saṅcay-ucchrita* and *aneka-mārga* must be translated in two ways like *ucchrita*, because they refer both to the glory and to the river, Ganga. As applied to glory, the first compound means that Samudragupta's generosity, bravery, self-control and knowledge of the letters form the layers by which the

glory towers itself up to the height of a mountain, and that every quality that follows, is higher and more excellent. As applied to the Ganga, the adjective alludes to the Indian belief that this river is first visible in the heavens as the milk-path, then dashing through the mid-region, it falls upon the Kailasa and lastly it rushes downwards to the plains. Thus to the looker-on standing on the plains and looking upwards, the water of the Gaugā would appear to be towering in ever rising layers. *Anēanātea*, literally 'which has more than one path', as applied to glory, means not only that the glory travelled in the three worlds, but that it followed different paths in the sense that it sprang from different causes such as generosity and so on. As applied to the Ganga, the word has only the first sense and it is well known that the Ganga is called *Trīp-thā ā*.

According to the translation given above, the last part of the panegyric tells us that Samratgopt's fame, which is personified as is frequently met with in Indian poems, occupied the whole earth, and thus found it impossible to spread forth any more on this sphere. Thus embarrassed, the fame went up to the palace of the lord of gods and there found a new path for itself, along which it moved happily. Verse 9 informs us of the result which was brought about by this ascent to heaven. Then, says the poet, the king's glory attained to a similarity with the Gauger. For, like the river it flows through the three worlds heaven, mid air and earth. Every one of these thoughts and images occurs frequently in the works of court poets. Almost in every *prastāva* and in a large number of *cāṇ* or verses containing flattery, it is told that the glory of the king under description rushes forward into heaven. The most usual expression used to convey this thought is the statement that the glory of such and such a person fills up the three worlds. There are many places, however, where



the ascent of fame (as is here spoken of), and the figurative motives for the same are also given in different ways. Thus, it is said in a verse of the poet Amrtadatta, who was a contemporary of the Kashmirian Śaṅkha Śrīha-buddhi (c. 1352-70 A. D.) in the *Subhāṣitāvalī*, No. 2157 (Peterson's ed.)<sup>7</sup>—

*Arūḥ = le-ata-jā, = e-a-ata-ambādhi-ma-janāt*  
*ātapa-t-āpa = t-āpa-ārtatā-d-ā-da-am*

'Thy fame, Oh Lord of the earth which was, as it were, leached with cold through its bathing in the four oceans, went up to the sphere of the sun in order to warm itself.'

Another conception we find in Śaṅkha the bard of King Harṣa of Kashmir (c. 941-61 A. D.), in the *Rājeṇḍra-kāṇḍīputa*, verse 67 (Subhāṣitāvalī, No. 2027) —

*Kāntāre n-a-kānta-r-a-sat-tāre n-a-k-a-bhītam*  
*ut-tā-r-a-pallāsa-m-a-sat-tā-ma-tat-ānta-m-a*  
*dhīrāntā-ket-a-a-sat-tā-pa-lāsa-r-a-bhīrāntā-r-a-kimōpate*  
*kante n-a-lāsa-kānta-r-patāre rāntā te kintā-dh*

'Thy glory, Oh Lord of the earth, which shines white like the inner sprouts of the *ketaka*, wandered about in forests and groves, on the banks of rivers, on the slopes of mountains, in cities and on the shores of the ocean, and then, as if exhausted [by this long journey], it sprouts up, as white flowers, on the lovely plots of plantain trees in the garden of gods.'

These modes of expression are quite complex and bombastic in comparison with Harisena's simple and natural conception of the motive for the ascent of fame. No doubt, this is accounted for by the change in the

<sup>7</sup> See *Subhāṣitāvalī*, introduction, p. 4, and *Poems of Indian Anti-quities*, Vol. II, p. 247.



intentional. Because all the manuals of poetics are unanimous on the point that the essence of elevated prose to be used in romances and stories consists in the length of compounds, while the different schools are not so unanimous regarding the admissibility of long compounds in verses. Thus Dandin is in the *Ācārśāstra*, I, 80-81—

vyāhṛtāśch na tadev etad—gadyasya jantam  
 prayatnāt—ślokaścaśāstrān—ślokanām—parūṇam  
 tad—ślokaścaśāstrān—ślokaścaśāstrān—ślokaścaśāstrān  
 ślokaścaśāstrān—ślokaścaśāstrān—ślokaścaśāstrān

11. 'The sparkle or strength [of language] consists in the frequency of compounds; it is the very life of [poetical] prose. Even in verses it is regarded as the main feature by those who do not belong to the Southern School.'

102. 'It is of many kinds, according to the mixture of a larger or smaller number of the long or short syllables, and it is found in romances and other similar works.'

Dandin's statement leaves no doubt about the fact that Harisena follows the style of the Southerners, the so-called *Varoarthi rīti*, which must have enjoyed in the fourth century the same high esteem as in later times, when a large number of writers belonging to different parts of India advocate it as the most beautiful. Harisena, however, could hardly have come from the south of India. His station at the court of Samudragupta shows that he lived in the north-east, in Pataliputra,<sup>2</sup> and probably belonged to a family settled in the same place from of old.

Apart from the use of long compounds in the prose parts, there is nothing very artificial in Harisena's language. Of the *prāśastikā*, he uses only the simplest kind of

<sup>2</sup> That Pataliputra and not Kanauj as is usually supposed was the capital of the Gupta Empire is seen from the verses from Fleet's No. VI, translated above, wherein a descendant of Candragupta II calls himself an inhabitant of Pataliputra.

alliteration, the *Parnanupāṇa*, and even this occurs principally in the prose parts<sup>10</sup> and that too, not many times. Of the *anubhāṣanāras*, he uses *Rupata* very often and *Iparā* and *Śleṣa* more rarely. Two instances where the last *anubhāṣa*, i. e., *Śleṣa*, occurs have been discussed above. A third instance of the same is met with in line 25 in the epithets of Samudragupta :

*sa bhavāth ūtaya prajāya-bhūta-pāṇa-śleṣa-śleṣa*

which is to be translated thus: 'Of an incarnation after prince who is the cause of the elevation of the good and of the destruction of the bad and thus who revealed the unfathomable spirit (Brahman) that is the cause of the origination and the destruction of the world which consists of both good and bad people'. The poetic figure used here is *Śleṣa-mūlaṁ Rupatam*, i. e., a metaphor which is brought about by the double meaning of the words used. The instance reminds us very much of the play on words found in Subandhu and Bāṇa. This is, however, the only instance of the kind in the whole of the *prastāva*, a circumstance which shows that Harisena like Kalidāsa and other adherents of the *Valmiki-gaṇ*, indeed, regarded *Śleṣa* as a poetic embellishment but himself shunned the inauspiciously frequent use of the same. Harisena, however, does not direct his attention so much to the use of the *anubhāṣas*, as to fine execution of the pictures of the several situations under description, and to the choice as well as the arrangement of words. Of the former, verse 4, the only verse that can be restored

10. For instance line 1<sup>st</sup> *pāṇa-śleṣa-sa bhūta-pāṇa-śleṣa* line 20 *sa bhūta-pāṇa-śleṣa-sa bhūta-pāṇa-śleṣa* line 26 *sa bhūta-pāṇa-śleṣa-sa bhūta-pāṇa-śleṣa* and so on.

11. [Samudragupta is here called the Inscrutable Being who is the cause of the prosperity of the pious and the destruction of the wicked i. e. an incarnation of Viṣṇu.—D.C.S.]



completely is a typical example of a point which depicts the master in which Śaundaryā was ordained by his father to be his successor—

1. "Here is a noble man," with these words, the father embraced him with showers of love that spoke of his affection and looked at him, with eyes heavy with tears and overcome with love—the courtiers breathing freely with joy and the king and queen and noble looking up with glad faces and said to him: "Protect then this woele earth!"

It is not possible to have a more concise and a more vivid picture of the situation. There is not a word which is unnecessary and one knows as if he sees the scene with his own eyes, less the old Śaundaryā, in the presence of his sons each of whom hoped to have the highest fortune, and of his court household who were at a loss the father was and on an unworthy person turns round to his favourite son. This verse is one of the best productions the Indians have given us, in the domain of miniature portraits, which is their forte. This very example would also illustrate Harisena's special care for the choice and arrangement of words, a qualification which can be easily seen even in other parts of the composition, both metrical and prose. In the prose part, there are inserted between the long compound at definite intervals shorter phrases, in order to enable the reader to draw his breath and the hearer to catch the sense. In the long compound the words are so chosen as to bring about a certain rhythm through the succession of short and long vowels, and care is taken to see that this rhythm changes from time to time. This can be best seen by a representation of the

2. *śaundaryā* which is included to read *śaundaryā* for *śaundaryā* in the DCS.





this may be compared in the field of classical literature, *Śārngadharaśāstrī*, No. 1235.

A third most favourite poetic representation of fame is met with in the second compound in line 23, referring to Samudragupta. 'Whose fame arising from the re-establishment of many fallen kingdoms and of many extinguished royal races, is tired by its journey through the three worlds.' Hemacandra also in the *prāśasti* to his grammar, verse 29, similarly speaks of the want of rest for his master's fame<sup>14</sup>—

*yad-dor-mandata-bhūdalilīta-dhanur dandana śādhāthipa*  
*kṛitam tauri-kulāt = tauri (prāś.) dalot-kund ā adātān jālah,*  
*bhīrūt, ā trin jagat khetā-nānān tan Mālavīnān vyatubād =*  
*āpāṇān itana-mandale ca dhara e gānda-sthale = 'exhaustion'*

'With the bow bent into a circular form by your arm stretched round, you won, Oh king Śiddha, your fame that shines in white like the blooming flower of the yumine, being rendered helpless through the exhaustion of wandering through the three worlds that your fame has at last rested itself on the pale, round breasts and the white cheeks of the Mālava women.'

In line 25, again, we have quite an original conception which is meant to illustrate how far Samudragupta's glory obscured that of all his rivals. The poet there praises Samudragupta as a ruler 'who, in consequence of the overflow of his many virtues elevated through hundreds of good works, wiped off with his feet the fame of other kings.'

The idea seems to be that the leaves on which the name of other kings is written, lie before Samudragupta. The flow of his virtues streams over them, and he is only

14 Cf. also the verse quoted above from the *Raocandrakarmapūra*



required to stir his foot, to obliterate the praises of the rulers of antiquity. I cannot point out anything in literature, which exactly corresponds to this. Nevertheless, it cannot escape the attention of any one that the conception quite fits in with the character of the style of court poets.

In the next line (26), we meet with a comparison which occurs frequently in the epics and is used in later times by almost every Classical poet and in every *pramāṇa*—where Samudragupta is celebrated as a king 'who resembles Dharmadeva, Varuna, Indra and Antaka (i.e., the guardian-gods of the four directions'. Equally favourite is the immediately following *līpamā*—'who puts to shame the preceptor of gods by his sharp and subtle understanding, as Tamburu, Narada and others by his lovely performances of music'. About the comparison of the king with Ilaṣpati, we have spoken above. As for the statement that Samudragupta was a better musician than the well-known *tantrika* and the sage of gods who invented the *vāṇī*, an explanation is furnished by the coins, as Fleet has pertinently remarked, on which Samudragupta is represented as a lute-player. For the last climax of hyperbolic representation, we also meet with analogies in the *Lāṭyās*. When Harṣena says in lines 27-28, that his master is 'a god dwelling in this world, whose many marvellous and noble deeds deserve to be praised for a very long time and who is a man only in that he performs acts necessary according to worldly conventions', we are reminded, in the first place, of Bana's description of his patron, Harṣa (*Harṣa-avata*, pp. 20-21), where his deeds have been put on a level with those of Indra, Prajāpati, Viṣṇu and Śiva, and he himself has been identified with these gods. A still more important parallel is provided by the statements of the Prākṛit poet, Vakpati, about Yaśovarman of Kanauj (*Varahavihāra*, verses 167-80), according to which, the king

is an incarnation of Bāl-ka-Hari or Viṣṇu. As is to be expected of a poet of the eighth century, Vākpati expresses the idea with a greater elaboration of details.<sup>15</sup>

Many more points of relationship with the *śāyā* literature can be discovered in the individual expressions of our *pramāṇa*. It would suffice if I only point to *upagubhya* (for *ā-ti-ya*), *bhāva-pūra*, *man-ānana*, *śrīha-tyāhita*, *bā-pa-catu* (cf. in verse 4 *adāt-ud-tinna-hara* (verse 5 *uccapakara*, *to-ḥita*), *śrīha-pūta*, and the frequent use of *iphuta*. The parallel passages given in both the Petersburg lexicons spare me the trouble of giving here many new quotations. Whoever is familiar with the diction of the *śāyā* will not require any special proof, but will at once recognise the affinity of these and other modes of expression to those used by Classical poets.

Now, we have to notice a number of cases, especially in the prose part, where Harṣena obviously tried to surpass his rivals in the composition of *pramāṇa*. To this category belong most of the long compounds in lines 1-24, in which the closing part especially comes new and then as a surprise and deviates very much from the usual track. Thus, in line 24, for instance, instead of saying that Samudragupta had acquired great power through the forcible extinction of many kings of Āryavarta, Harṣena represents his master as a prince 'who was great through his power which expanded itself through the forcible extinction of many kings of the land of the Āryas'. Perhaps, the simple and natural expression *śaśa-labha-mahaprabhāṇa* appeared too trivial to the poet, and for that reason, he went in for the more artificial one *śaśa-labha-prabhāṇa-matatah*. So also the last parts of the following compound phrases are unusual and deliberately sought—

<sup>15</sup> The dedication of the king is already found in old times e.g. in the *Maṇavaśtharmasūtra* VII. 49.

1. lines 22-23 — 'whose fierce sovereignty [the neighbouring kings] propitiated by means of the payment of all the taxes [levied], the carrying out of his orders, salutations and visits' 2. (lines 24) — 'the mighty bravery of his arm which held the whole earth in bondage, received homage from the inhabitants of all countries in various ways, such as causing themselves to be presented to him, offering daughters and other presents, and requesting him for a decree with the Garuda seal for the possession of their country' 3. lines 26) — 'whose heart had willingly received the formula and the consecration for the deliverance of the poor, the miserable, the helpless and the sick'. Whoever will take the trouble of reading through other published *prasaṅga*, will easily see the originality of these modes of expression and judge them according to their worth. The fact, however, that Harisena makes use of deliberately sought modes of expression is to be explained by the existence of many other similar panegyrics whose scope and rhetorical diction he tried to surpass.

The clearest proof, however, for the fact that Harisena's composition does not at all belong to the beginning of the *Śaśa* period is provided by those passages in which he speaks of the king's peculiar poetic activity. In this connection, we should refer above all to what we have of the eighth verse wherein the poet declares —

'He alone is worthy of the thoughts of the learned. Because what excellence is there, which would not be his. He has made him the barrier of law, his is the sprouting tree that shines purely like the rays of the moon, his is the wisdom which pierces down to the truth, his is the self-control, his is the poetic style which is worthy of study, and his are the poetic works which multiply the spiritual treasures of poets.'

In the second part of his composition, Harisena again refers to the last point when he says in line 27 that



Samudragupta's 'title as the Prince of Poets was well established by the composition of many poems worthy of the imitation of the learned' If one adds to this, verse 3 spoken of above and the expressions used by Harisena about his person, it naturally follows that, during the reign of Samudragupta, the *kāvya* literature was in full bloom, and that the conditions at his court were absolutely similar to those which are reported to have prevailed in later times at the courts of Kanauj, Kashmir, Ujjain, Dhārā and Kalyāṇi, and which are found to exist even to this day, here and there in India. The cultivators of Sanskrit poetry, who were called by the names of *hata* or *budha* or *vidvān*, were not born or self-taught poets but were professional learned men or Pandits who studied the *śāstras*, i. e. at the least, *Vyākaraṇa*, *Āraṇyaka*, *Śraut* and *Chandas*, and who wrote according to the hard and fast rules of poetics, as is shown by the form of Harisena's little composition. The Sanskrit *kāvya*, which owed its origin to court-patronage, and which could exist only by means of the same, was assiduously cultivated at the courts. The king supported and raised to honour such poets, and even he himself, and with him his high officers too, emulated with their proteges. Perhaps he had even a *kāvīndra*, or a poet-laureate, appointed. At any rate, the title, as such, was in use in the days of Samudragupta, the title which in later times occurs very often in Sanskrit literature, and which even at present, is given away by Indian princes, associated as it is with many benefits. His court could not thus have been the only one which patronized the exertions of the Pandits in the domain of poetry.



## IV

*Gornat Inscription of the Reign of Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman*

The result, obtained from the examination of Harapens's fragments point to the provisional supposition that the *kāśa* literature was in bloom, at least in the whole of the fourth century, and the works, composed at that time, do not essentially differ from the samples of Vaidik literature preserved to us. Beyond this, we cannot go with the help of the Gupta inscriptions known to us up to this time. It, therefore, becomes necessary to consider the only great Sanskrit inscription which can, with certainty, be placed in a considerably earlier age. It is Rudradāman's inscription on the well known rock on the way from Junagadh-Garnagara to the present Gornār, a holy mountain known as Ujāyātī or Ujayanti in earlier times. This inscription would be more properly called 'the prelude' of the restoration of the Sufarsma lake, during the reign of Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman. Its age is pretty certainly fixed, in the first place, by the name of the king and *kṣatrapa*\* Gaṣṭana, who is spoken of as Rudradāman's grandfather and in the second place, by the date of the storm which shattered down the embankment of the Sufarsma lake. Gaṣṭana is no doubt rightly identified with king Tassantes who, as Ptolemy informs us, ruled in Ozece or Ujayini. The Greek name quite corresponds with the Indian name, not merely on the ground of other similar cases which occur and in which the Indian palatal sounds are represented by the Greek dentals with *g* following,<sup>1</sup> but because even the Indian pronunciation of the palatals varies between *ṣa* and *ṣaḥ* as well as between *ṣa* and *ṣaḥ*, and we frequently hear of

\* *Mahākṣatrapa* (D.C.S.)

1 Cf. *ṣaṣṭa* = *ṣaṣṭa* and *Damodara* = *damunā* (Yamunā)

*hya* and *dya* as combinations with the sibilants.<sup>2</sup> The possibility that Ptolemy could have meant any other Castana than that of our inscription must be regarded as out of question, because the name occurs in no other dynasty, and even amongst the Western Ksatrapas, it is only the grandfather of Rudradāman, who is so named. Thus, if we accept this identification of names and persons, it follows that Castana must have reigned before 150 A.D. and further that his grandson Rudradāman can, in no case, be placed later than in the first half of the third century, probably even earlier. The settling of the date becomes even more accurate through the fact that the fixing of the beginning of the Gupta era in the year 318 or 319 makes quite probable the view already maintained by Bhagvānlāl, Bhāu Dāji, Bhandarkar and others, according to which the date of the inscription in question, i.e. the year 72, refers to the Śaka era and thus corresponds to our year 151 A.D. This date is the first of a long series, which continues down to the year 310. Inscriptions<sup>3</sup> provide the following dates: 103 for Rudradāman's son Rudrasimha, 127 for Rudrasimha's son Rudrasena, and 252 for Nāgī Rudrasena.

2 See the remarks on the reverse of the table of letters in my *Guide to the Elementary Course of Sanskrit*. I shall in another place furnish proof that the modern pronunciation of the Indian palatals is very old.

3 The three dated inscriptions are—that on the rock of Gunda (*Ind. Ant.* Vol. X, p. 157) that on the pillar of Jajdan (*Journ. Bomb. Br. Roy. As. Soc.* Vol. VIII, pp. 234 ff.) in which according to an impression of Dhruva's the date is to be read as [tr]yānarāyate 100(+) 1 and one unpublished inscription on a pillar in Okhāmandal of which I possess a sketch and a photograph. The view that the era used by the Western Ksatrapas is the Śaka era is found at first in *Journ. Bomb. Br. Roy. As. Soc.* Vol. VIII, pp. 243 ff. and is further developed in Bhandarkar's *Early History of the Dekkan* pp. 19 ff. See also *Journ. Roy. As. Soc. N.S.* 1890, pp. 632 ff. I opposed the same in *Arch. Surv. West Ind.*, Vol. V, p. 23 when I believed that the beginning of the Gupta era fell in the second century A.D.

while on the numerous coins are frequently represented almost all the decades between 100 and 300. During this long period, the successors of Castana appear to have maintained their sovereignty over Western India, except for a short interruption and to have been in possession of Mālwa as well as the neighbouring provinces of Guharāt and Kāthiāwar. There is nothing in the inscriptions before us, that would admit the conclusion that their capital was ever removed from Ujjain further westwards. On the other hand, our inscription shows quite clearly that the residence of the prince lay outside of Guharāt and Kāthiāwar, as his officer *Suvivakha*, according to line 18, was governor of *Anarta*<sup>4</sup> and *Surāstra*. The successors of the Ksatrapas, in the sovereignty over Mālwa and the whole of Western India, were the Guptas, whose conquest of the former province falls before or in the Gupta year 4<sup>2</sup>, i.e. 400-01 or 401-02 A.D., as is shown by Fleet's No. 3. Accordingly, it is to be expected that the last date of the Ksatrapas coming from Castana's time cannot be far removed from the Gupta year 4<sup>2</sup>. And this is actually the case, if the year 300 on the Ksatrapa coins is interpreted as a year of the Śaka era. Then it corresponds to the year 388 or 389 A.D., and is removed only by eleven years from the year in which the conquest of Mālwa could have taken place at the latest. Though this very consideration is enough to commend the identification of the era, used by the Ksatrapas with that of the Śaka kings, there are still many other reasons of no less importance, which would confirm the same. The titles of Castana are *Rājan*, *Ksatrapa* or *Mahāk-atripa*, and *Maurya*. The word *k-atripa* is no doubt, as was long ago asserted, an adaptation of the Persian *Kabatripa*,<sup>5</sup> *Satrap*.

4. *Anarta* included Northern Kāthiāwar and Northern Gujard up to the Mahi.

5. [Old Persian *Kabdashtrapāvan* — DCS.]





the Indo-Scythian kingdom as long as it was in existence. As for Rudradāman, in particular, I see a clear confession of his dependence in the expression (line 15 *śāśa śaśhī-ata-Mahākāśatrapa śahdēna*, 'by Rudradaman) who had himself won the title *Mahākāśatrapa*. According to my view,<sup>10</sup> the author means to say that Rudradāman did not inherit the title *Mahākāśatrapa* from his father or grandfather (although they possessed it), but that he had to win it by means of his special services and that he received it from his suzerain. To this interpretation, I am specially led by the meaning of the very analogous phrase, *samadhīrutapāñca mahāśabda*, 'he who has won the five *mahāśabdā* (i.e., either five great titles, or the right to have the royal music band to play)', which is used in a very large number of inscriptions of Nāmantar or vassal chiefs. Moreover, even supposing that Rudradaman had made himself independent and had himself taken a title, it appears to me improbable that he should have chosen the title *Mahākāśatrapa*. In that case, he would have certainly named himself *Mahārāja*, *Rajārāja*, *Rājātirāja*, or *Rājāśhrāja*, as the independent kings of the first and second centuries always did. Thus Castana, in all probability was a dependent of some Indo-Scythian king and it is, therefore, not possible that he should have founded a new era. He must have used the era of his suzerain, and the same must be supposed in connection with his grandson. If then, as I believe it must be assumed, this latter also bore the same relation to the Indo-Scythians, there can be no doubt regarding the interpretation of the date of the *Curān prajāpti*.

According to this calculation, then, the destruction of the Sudarsana lake by the storm mentioned in our inscription

10. [Read *namnā* for *śahdēna*—D.C.S.]

11. Bhagavant thinks otherwise. According to him the idea is that Rudradaman freed himself from the yoke of a suzerain.

falls in the year 150 or 151 A.D. The inscription itself, however, must have been written yet later, sometime towards the end of the first century of the Śaka era, i.e. between 160 and 170 A.D., because it is said in lines 1-13 that the restoration of the dam was attended with great difficulties. Thus it is most conclusively proved that even during the second half of the second century, there was in existence a *kāvya* literature. Although a compiler which might have given us the exact character of the composition is wanting, still it can be easily seen that it contains a *gadya-kāvya* as such. Its style is similar to that of the prose part of Harisena's *kāvya* in many respects and besides the use of *alanāḍar*, there is an obvious effort on the part of the poet, to satisfy all the requirements prescribed for prose composition by poetics. At the same time, however, it cannot be denied that its worth is very considerably less than that of the Allahābād *prafats*, and that its author did not by far possess the imagination and talent of Harisena. The language itself which is, indeed, generally speaking, flowing and good shows several deviations from the usage of Classical poetry and even presents some actual mistakes. Thus in *.. no ā garbhāt* (line 9) there is a wrong *sandhi* made. Among other offences against the rules of orthography prescribed by grammar are the frequent omission of *c* before *ch* and the use of the *am-ara* for *a* and *ā* in the body of words, as well as for *m* at the end<sup>12</sup> though both these, it is true, are sanctioned by *vyākaraṇa*. Further, there is seen the influence of Prakrit in the word *amāttarāṇi*, line 7 which stands for *amāntarāṇi*. Even

12. The frequent avoidance of a *sandhi* is not incorrect because, according to a well-known *śūtra*, the *sandhi* depends upon *saṃyoga*, i.e., it is to be made only if the words actually belong together. In the prose inscriptions, *sandhi* is usually not made where we would have a comma or a semi-colon.

the form *triviat* used only on the analogy of *triviat*, etc., is not Classical, but belongs to the language of the epics and the Puranas as is shown by the quotations in the Petersburg Lexicon. If the long syllables in *nirvāṇam* = *anantya* = *ānantiya* which are against rule, are not mere mistake in writing of the stone engraver, — although in the case of *ragena* for *rāṇa* no other assumption is possible, — then they must be regarded as only instances of Prakrit influence. Because the Prakrit dialects frequently represent *ni* by *ñi* or *ni*, and the Guṇarāṇi *jit*, 'conquer', and *jitaṇam*, 'to conquer', agree with the long syllable in *arajitya*. So also, the instrumental *patinā* in line 11 is formed against Pāṇini's rules, though it is in agreement with the usage of the Vedic and epic language. There is also a mistake of syntax in *anyatra sangramesu* line 10, 'except in battles', which ought to be *anyatra sangrāmabhyah*. So also the form *pratyākhyāt-ārambham* (line 17) would be a worse mistake of syntax, as I believe in all probability it cannot be regarded as an error in writing for *pratyākhyat-ārambhe*. Last of all, the phrase *paranyena ekāṅgavibhūtanam* = *na pīthitāṁ kīṭāṇāṁ* (line 5) is a hard nut to crack. No full-fledged Classical poet has taken the liberty in this way. On the other hand, a similar phrase is more frequently met with in the epics.<sup>12</sup> The many points of similarity with the epics, which the language of the Guṇār *pravāṇi* exhibits, could have led to the supposition that the author had cultivated himself exclusively by the reading of epics and that a *lāṅkā* proper was not at all known to him. But such a supposition is contradicted, first of all, by the general impression, which his composition makes. Whoever reads it attentively would feel that, in the matter of development of the style, it shows a stage considerably in advance of the epics. Further the supposition is contradicted

<sup>12</sup> Cf. for instance *Andr.* XII 28. *Āśvabhūtanam* = *ay* = *ābham* under *bhūte* in the Petersburg Lexicon.

by several particulars leading to a similar conclusion, especially the important passage in line 14, wherein the author enumerates the attributes of a good composition, prevalent in his time.

As for the points of affinity with the *lāṭā* style proper, which this *prasa* exhibits, it is to be first of all noticed that the author knew very well the canons laid down by Dandin as common to all schools according to which *ojas* or *saṃśā-bhāṣita*, the frequency and length of compounds, is the principal feature of a prose composition. In the *prasa* it also, the compounds occur more frequently than single words, and the compounds themselves often exhibit a conspicuous length. Thus in the very first line, there is a broken compound which consists of nine words with twentythree letters. Such compounds and others extending over between ten and twenty letters are numerous. Once in the description of the king (line 11) the author goes to the extreme of having a compound word which comprises seventeen words with forty letters. As compared with Harṣeṇa's performance, that of the Gujaratī author is by all means a modest one, though the latter far surpasses what the epic poets have been capable of doing or have regarded as permissible. As with Harṣeṇa, a rhythmic arrangement of letters in the longer compounds is often noticeable, as for instance, in lines 6 and 9 ff. Hand in hand with the length and number of compounds, goes the length of the sentences. The *prasa* apparently contains only five sentences with forty-nine *grantha*, of which the fourth sentence alone consists of more than twenty-three *grantha*. Harṣeṇa surpasses the Gujaratī writer in this point also, and this is an important point, because his whole *lāṭā*, though longer in extent, contains only one sentence. Of the *śabdāraṇakas*, we have only the *Anapṛāsa*, and the repetitions of parts of words, more seldom of whole words, as well as of single letters



producing a similar sound, are very frequently met with. The specially remarkable instances are—

*garubhira-ābhāṣita-nāgano Rūṣṭagāṇa* line 4, *ṛta-ṛtina* line 5, *prāṣṭināḥ sa-mānā* line 6, *prāṣṭana-titarāṇa* line 10, *prāṣṭina* *Viśāḍāśināḥ* line 11, *lāṇa-ṛtāḍāṇa-ṛtāḍāṇa* (loc. cit.), *adheyanam Yauthayanam* line 12, *hast-ochray-ārjit-orjita*<sup>14</sup> line 13, *mayad, ānāḥ vidyāṇam* (loc. cit.), *parāṇa-tarāṇa* (loc. cit.), *dāṇa-pāṇāṇaṇa* (loc. cit.), *adipadya* line 14, *prāṇa-ānāṇmānā* (loc. cit.), *nāṇāḥ* (loc. cit.) *Rūṣṭagāṇa* line 15, *paurā-ānapadaḥ paṇam* line 16, *paurā-ānapadaḥ, in-a* line 16, *āṇa-āṇaṇa* (line 16).

The *Varṇānuprāsa*, which do not strike us at first sight, but which are, nevertheless, not less characteristic, are specially numerous in *giri-mūhara-taru-tat-ātātāt-ōpataḥ paḍāṇa-sarāṇa-ōhara-vidhāṇa* line 6, where the repetitions of consonants and vowels are linked together very skillfully. Thus it is quite evident that the author took great troubles with these word ornaments and attached great importance to them. His use of these far surpasses what the epic literature can present, and stands pretty on a level with what we have in Harṣana. The word *yathārtha hast-ochray-ārjit-orjita-dharm-ānurāga* (lines 12-14) is just exactly in the *kāvya* style, for the compound *ārjit-orjita* is very much favoured by the later court poets. As for the *Arth-āṇkāṣa*, our author uses them but very rarely. Thus there are only two *Upamā* to be noted. In line 1-2, it is said that the lake or rather the embankment thereof is *parvata-pratipaddhi*,<sup>15</sup> 'resembling the spot of a mountain', and, in line 8, the dried-up lake is spoken of as *maru-dhanta kaṣṭha*, 'resembling a sandy desert'. In the former instance, the expression *pratipaddhi* is quite characteristic of the *kāvya* style. We have an *Uprekṣā* in the already mentioned passage, *parjanyaṇa*

14. [*Parvata-ṣṭhā-pratipaddhi* lines 1-2]—D.C.S.]



*ekāraṇa-bhūṭayam* = 12a *prithuṣaṁ kṛtāṁ* and a faint attempt at *śleṣa* in line 8, where it is said that the lake had become *atibhīṣṇo dardda[rlanam]*. For the rest, the author neglects the numerous opportunities which are offered to him, for instance, in the description of effect of a representation of facts marked with strong outlines, than on the conglomeration of more or less conventional figures of sense. It must be conceded that he succeeds quite well in individual descriptions, though he fails in the fineness of execution and the elaboration of details, which are found to be present in Harṣena. The passage in lines 3-7 describing the destruction of the lake, reads best notwithstanding many important lacunae. Freely rendered, the passage would read thus—

'In the year seventy-two 72 [in the reign] of the king and Great Satrap Rudradaman whose name is uttered by the worthy [praying for purity] the son [of the king, and Great Satrap,\* Lord Jayadaman] the grandson of the king and Great Satrap, Lord Cūṭana the mention of whose name brings purity—on the [fifth or fifteenth] day of the dark half of the month Mārgaśīrṣa a storm with great streaming showers, as it were, reduced the earth to one single ocean, the terribly augmented force of the Suvarṇasikā, the Palasini and other rivers of the mountain Urayat broke through the dam although proper remedial measures were taken, the water agitated by the whirlwind which [raged] with fearful violence as it at the end of the world age and which shattered down mountain-peaks, trees, rocks, terraces, temple-turrets, gates, abodes and triumphal columns, the water scattered about and tore to pieces [the and]

\* [Jayadāman was a Satrap and not a Great Satrap—DCS]

15 [First—DCS]

this [lake crammed] with stones, trees, bushes and circles of creepers that were thrown down, was broken up down to the bottom of the stream.'

The small number of *Arth-alankara* is richly counter-balanced by the fourth word in line 14 which praises in all probability Rudradaman's skill in poesy, and contains, without question, the views of the author regarding the requirements of a good composition. Unfortunately, the word is mutilated. After *sphuta-lagu-madhura-citra-kānta-labda-rama, o-dar-ālanṛta-gadya-padya* eight letters have been obliterated, followed by *na*. The last letter shows that the expression ended with the *ī*-stem of an *a*-stem. Immediately after *gadya-padya* only the word *kāya* can come, as it is absolutely necessary to complete the two expressions *gadya* and *padya*. The remaining six letters should then have been a phrase like *vidhāna-pratīna, raṇa-luṇa, raṇa-nṛta* or like [*a-tadana-nṛta*. Now if we consider what is said of Rudradaman in line 13, viz., that he had acquired greater renown by the complete study, the preservation, the thorough understanding, and the skill in the use, of the great books, such as grammar, politics, music and logic, we must go in for one of the first series of expressions proposed. Because, the practising of classical poetry is the natural complement of the cultivation of the abstruse *jātras* in the case of the Pāṇḍit, and both these have been very frequently extolled as the qualifications of Indian kings. These considerations make it quite probable that the compound in question, when completed, should stand as *sphuta-lagu-madhura-citra-kānta-labda-rama, o-dar-ālanṛta-gadya-padya-kāya-vidhāna-pratīna*. Now, if we take the author on his word, and suppose that he is stating only facts, nothing more nor less, then it would follow that Rudradaman must have devoted himself to the cultivation of court poetry like Samudragupta and Harṣavardhana. Then the passage in question would further prove that

the *kāvya* literature, in the second century, had been developed to such an extent that even the grandson of a foreign Satrap like Castana could not escape its influence. On the other hand, if it is thought more advisable to understand the expressions of praise in the *prasaṁsa*, with a qualification, and to think that these expressions, regardless of actual facts, only concern themselves with representing Rudraśāman as an ideal Indian prince—as the poet's fancy was pleased to depict, even then we would be justified in drawing this conclusion, at least, that during the second century it was the custom at Indian courts to occupy oneself with *kāvya*. Even this result in itself is of no little significance inasmuch as it proves that the invasion of the Scythians and other foreign races had extinguished the national art as little as the sciences. Further as regards the characteristics which the *prasaṁsa* prescribes for *gadya-padya*, 'the compositions in prose and metrical form', it is to be noted that they essentially agree with those which are given by Daṇḍin for the *Vaidarbhī-rīti*, in accordance with an old tradition.<sup>16</sup> In the *kaṣṭhārtī*, I, 41-42, we have—

*Śleṣaḥ prasādaḥ samatā mādhuṛyam sukumārataḥ  
arthavyaktir-udātātanaḥ—ca śleṣaḥ kantiḥ samādhayaḥ  
iti Vaidarbha-mārgasya prasādaś ca mātā smṛtāḥ*

Of these ten fundamental attributes of the *Vaidarbhi* style, the *prasaṁsa* names three, viz., *mādhuṛya*, *kanti*, and *udātātana*, and there is no reason why the *mādhuṛa* and *kānta* of the inscription should be interpreted otherwise than as *samādhā*, 'full of sentiment', and *sarva-jagat-kānta*, 'pleasing to the whole world' or 'lovely', respectively. On the

<sup>16</sup> The same are mentioned in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Ch. XVI—

*śleṣaḥ prasādaḥ samatā samādhir-  
mādhuṛyam—śleṣaḥ padma-sukumārasyam  
arthavya ca vyaktir—udātātā ca  
kāntiḥ—ca kāvyaṁ gūṇā dāś—śleṣaḥ*



*prajasti* was acquainted with some theory of the *Anukāras*. In accordance with the proposed bluing up of the lacaræ and the explanations offered so far, the whole clause may be thus rendered—

{[by the king and Great Satrap Rudradaman]} who {was expert in the composition of} prose and metrical *lajyas*, which are easily intelligible, charming, full of sentiment, capable of awakening wonder, lovely, noble with the conventional use of words, embellished {with the prescribed figures of speech}. Thus, whatever we may say about Rudradaman busying himself with poetry—a fact which is very probable, though of course we cannot be absolutely sure about it—so much is certain that the author of our *prajasti* lays on poets conditions very similar to those prescribed by Dandin, that in the second century there must have been already in existence romances and other works in high prose as well as compositions not preserved to us, and that there also existed an *Anukāra-śāstra*.

## V

*Nāstī Inscription No. 18, dated in the Nineteenth Kṛmāl Year of Śrī-Pulamāya*

A further contribution to the knowledge of the *lajya* style of the second century and especially of the poetic ideas and comparisons in vogue at the time is made by the *prajasti* of a cave which was given over to the monks of the Bhadrāvāṇīya school in the nineteenth year of the reign of the Andhra king Śrī-Pulamāya. The date of the inscription can be only approximately determined at present. Nevertheless it must be somewhat older than the Gṛnā *prajasti* discussed above. Śrī-Pulamāya, like Caṣṭana, is, as we know, mentioned by Ptolemy, under the name of Śrī-Polemātor or Śrī-Polemonas, as the ruler of Baithana, i.e., Parthāna or



Prastishāni on the Godāvarī river. Accordingly, the inscription in question will have to be placed somewhere about the middle of the second century. To the same result leads another circumstance which is put forth by Bhāṇu Dāji in *Journ. Bomb. Rev. As. Soc.*, Vol. VIII, p. 242. According to line 6 of our inscription, Pulomavi's father Gautamiputra Sātakarni extinguished the family of Khikharāta. In the inscriptions at Nāuk,<sup>1</sup> Junnar and Karle is mentioned a Kshharāta king and Satrap or Great Satrap Nahapāna, whose son-in-law, the Śaka Uśavadāta or Usabhadāta was a great patron of the Brahmins and Buddhists and made many grants in the Western Deccan as well as in the Konkan and Kathiāwar, and we are provided with several dates of his reign, from the year 40 to 46. The similarity of the names Khikharāta and Kshharāta makes it very probable that they denote one and the same person, a supposition which is also favoured by the circumstance that just the very districts, in which Uśavadāta made his grants, have been mentioned in lines 2f. of our inscription as parts of Sātakarni's dominions.<sup>2</sup> The title Satrap or Great Satrap borne by Nahapāna leads to the further conclusion that he was a dependent prince and the fact that, on his coins, the Kharosthi script is used side by side with the southern alphabet, proves his connection with the north-west where the Indo-Scythians were rulers. We may, therefore, suppose that he, like Rudradāman, used the Śaka era, and thus his last date, Samvat 46, would correspond to 124-25 A.D. Very probably his unfortunate

1 *Archaeological Survey of Western India* Vol. IV pp. 99-103 (Nos. 5-11).

2 See especially Inscription No. 20 in which a village given up as present by Uśabhadāta is again given away by an Andhra king Cf. *Arch. Surv. of Ind.* Vol. IV p. 106 (No. 6) and pp. 112-113 (No. 120).

war with Satakarni took place soon after this year. According to his inscriptions,<sup>3</sup> Śātakarni ruled for at least 24 years, and extinguished the Kshaharāta king and Satrap before the eighteenth year of his reign. For, the Nasik inscription No. 13, bearing this year, disposes of a village in the district of Govardhana,<sup>4</sup> which had in earlier times belonged to the dominions of Nahapāna. If then we assume that the battle between Nahapāna and Śātakarni took place in the year 47 of the Saka era used by the former, i.e., in 125-26 A.D., and in the fifteenth year of the reign of the latter, then the year of the writing of our inscription would be 153-54 A.D., by adding the 9 years of Satakarni and the 45 years of Pulumāyi to 125. Of course, it is possible that the date in question may be from ten to twelve years earlier or very few years later even. A later date than this does not seem to be probable, because the mention of Pulumāyi's name by Ptolemy shows that he must have been on the throne a long time before 151 A.D., the date of the completion of the Geography.<sup>5</sup>

If we accept these conjectures which at least possess a very high probability, then our inscription is about twenty years older than the *prāśasti* of the Sudarsana Lake and its style must be regarded as a proof for the growth of *lāya* in the middle of the second century. Although it is composed in an old Prakrit very much nearer to Pāli,

<sup>3</sup> *Arch. Sur. B. Ind. Vol. IV*, p. 106 (No. 14 last line).

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 105 where 14 is to be corrected to 18. [See *As. Soc. Vol. 1*, 1964, p. 191—DCS]

<sup>5</sup> Cf. also Bhandarkar's remarks in his *Early History of the Pels* on pp. 20 ff. where the date of the inscription is placed somewhat earlier. In several particulars I cannot agree with Bhandarkar. Jvastamiputra Śātakarni occupied the Nasik-Poona region from Uabhadra about the 10th year of his reign which roughly corresponded to the latest known date of Nahapāna i.e. year 46—124 A.D. [DCS]



still the results that may follow from its examination would of course be equally applicable to Sanskrit poetry, as there exists no separating barrier between Prakrit and Sanskrit *kāvya*. As far as the information provided by the *Alankāra śāstra* goes, both Sanskrit and Prakrit compositions are regarded as branches of a common stem and are both bound by the same laws. Accordingly, we find that all the known Prakrit *kāvya* are composed in obedience to the same canons as are those written in Sanskrit. They present the same varieties of style and the same types and the same *alankāras*, and it happens not seldom that one and the same author uses both Prakrit and Sanskrit. Even the author of our inscription must have known Sanskrit and been expert in Sanskrit *kāvya* also, because he appears to be guilty of some Sanskritisms. The compound *Vibhāṣavanta* (line 2) appears to be but a transliteration of the Sanskrit *Vibhāṣavanta*, since the Greek from *Θαλασσία* shows that the Prakrit name of the Rkṣavat began with *v* \*. Another apparently Sanskrit *sandhi* is found in *ke ar qata* (line 10), where the rule of the Prakrit demands *ke ar a qata*, i.e., *ke ar a qata* †. So also the form *pitupatni* (line 11) occurring in a writing of such a late date, must be looked upon as only an archaic imitation of *pitupatni* ‡. As far as I know, this is the only instance of a genitive in the dual number, which has been entirely lost even in older Prakrit literature. It is even possible that the inscription might have been at first composed in Sanskrit and then translated or transliterated, as the Prakrit, which resembled Pāli, was then, as even in much later times, the official language in Southern India \*. Whatever may be the case, so much is

\* [Vibhāṣavanta for Rkṣavat is quite correct—DCS.]

† [Another form of *qata* seems to be *qāna*—DCS.]

‡ [The rendering is doubtful—DCS.]

§ See on this my remarks on the Prakrit *Prasāda* and *prast* in the *Epigraphia Indica* Vol. I (DCS), pp. 41.

certain that the author was acquainted with the Sanskrit language as well as the Sanskrit literature.

His work is a *gadya-kāvya* like the Gūtnar inscription discussed above and belongs to the class of *prasaṁsa*. After the date given in quite an official manner, there follows the description of the king of kings Gautamiputra Satakarni written in a high poetic style, which together with the shorter praise of his mother Gautamī Balastī and of the cave prepared by her, in all, covers eight lines and a half, and altogether makes a gigantic sentence. Then there come at the end two short sentences which say that the queen gave away the cave to the Bhadrayanīya monks and that her grandson Pulumāyi assigned the village Pisācipadraka for the preservation of the sculpture and pictures. In these concluding sentences, the language is quite business-like, but even there we find the use of some figures on a small scale. In the first of these the mother is described by means of three epithets giving rise to alliteration, *Mahādevī Mahārāja mata Mahārāja-pitāmahī*, in the second, the king is spoken of not by name, but as *Mahādevya arakṣya secālāmo pīṣakāmo na[tā Sata-akṣiṇa]-pāthetaro* 'the grandson ever willing to serve and please the queen the grand-mother, the lord of the whole of the Deccan'. Thus even here the author does not forget his profession altogether.

As for the first and the main part of the *prasaṁsa*, its style entirely resembles that of the Gūtnar *prasaṁsa* in that long compounds are used to bring out *ojas* or the force of language. These run on almost exclusively from line 2, to line 6, then in line 7, the almost breathless reader is favoured with a resting pause, inasmuch as only short words are used. In the last line and a half of the

\* [Nidhi Pulamāyī Bhāṭṭanāgabhīṣaṅgī - DCS]



description of the king, the poet again takes a new leaf and uses towards the end the longest compound which contains sixteen words with forty-three letters: *Patana-kanula*, etc. The *Amgāśā* is more liberally used as is the case with the *Gernār prāśasti*. Thus we have in line 2 *Aśka-laka* in line 3 *patata-patata-ditasakata-lata*, *Samala-simha-a*, in the last parts of the compound in lines 3-4 *vasanata*, *calana-a* *rahana-a* *dasana-a*, and many more similar expressions. In one point, however, the Nāśik inscription differs from the *Gernār prāśasti*. While the latter disdains the use of the conventional similes of court poets, these are found in our *prāśasti* in a very large number and are sometimes very striking too. Just the very first epithet of the king *Himāyata-Mera-Mardara-patata-nama-rāra*, 'whose essence resembles that of the mountains Himavat, Mera and Mardara', is conceived quite in the *kāvya* style. Thus the author shows that comparisons of the king with these mountains, so favorite in later times, were in vogue even in his day. What he, in reality, means by the phrase in question is that Satakarni was possessed of great treasures, like the Himalaya, that he was the central point of the world and overshadowed the same with his bright, like the Mera, and that like the Mar-lara which was used as a rod by the gods at the time of churning out nectar, he knew how to bring to light and to acquire for himself Lakṣmī the *Fortuna regum*.

The correctness of this explanation can be easily demonstrated. For, the idea that the Himālaya hides within himself immeasurable treasures has been prevalent amongst the Indian people since a very old time, and it finds its expression in mythology, in that the abode of Kubera is located in the Himālaya. To the court poets the idea that riches are the *vara* of the Himālaya is so obvious that at times they do not express it at all, but



only heard at the same. But Kalidasa says in the *Raghuvamśa*, IV, 70—

*paraspāreṇa vijñātas = teṣaṃ = upāyana-jam ॥*  
*rājñā Himavatāḥ tāre rājñāḥ sāsar Himavatina*

As the {Gangas etc.} with presents in their hands, they understood each other's essence—the king, that of the Himavata, i.e., his riches, and the Himavata that of the king (i.e., his might).<sup>1</sup>

Equally old and generally prevalent is the conception that the mountain Meru is the centre of the world, and kings are very frequently compared with the same in *śloka*, in order to illustrate their great might. Thus, in the beginning of the *Kālamārśa*, Bāṇa says (Petersen's ed., p. 5, line 11) of king Śūdraka—

*Meru = na satadā bhūtan-ōpārjanana-jata = royal,*

'He resembles Meru in that all the worlds live in the shadow of his feet, i.e., are preserved through his protection just as they live in the shadow of the spot of the mountain. The comparison is also found in the inscription, e.g., in the *prasti* which forms a prelude to the grant of land made by the Caulukya king Mularāya I. It is said there<sup>2</sup> (line 3) *Meru = na satadā madhyasthaḥ*. He resembles Meru, in that he is always *madhyastha*, i.e., the centre of the world, and impartial.

As for the mountain Mandara, it is one the most well-known myths according to which it served the gods as a chariot-wheel, at the churning of the milk-ocean. As on

<sup>1</sup> See *loc. cit.* Vol. VI, p. 4. My translation as given there neglects only the second meaning of *madhyastha*. It is to say not improbable that the writer also means to say that Mularāya was the centre of the world, although the expression cannot apply to a petty ruler who possessed only a few miles of land. Such considerations, however, have no weight with a court poet.

that occasion Lakṣmī the goddess of wealth, came out, and she is often described as the representative of the royal power and splendour and even as the consort of kings, the kings themselves are often compared with the Mandara mountain in order to hint at the idea that they churn out Fortune from the ocean of the enemies. Thus in the *Harṣa-prita* (Kishinoué ed., p. 227, line 7), Bāṇa says, while describing King Puṣyabhūti, that he was *Mandara-maya* and *Lakṣmī-ranādarane* 'Mandara-like in drawing out Lakṣmī'. This same thought is further elaborated in verse 7 of the *Agastya-praśasti*,<sup>11</sup> a composition of the seventh century, written in a high Gāuḍīya style, where it is said of king Kumāragupta -

*dharmatāṇa-gaṇa-kāṭipati-saṁma-saṁvāda-durīth-oda-mitha-  
lakṣmī-saṁpraṣṭi-hetuh-sapadi-samathito Mandarabhūya-sena* /

'Who became the Mandara and immediately churned out the terrible army of the illustrious Jānavarman, a moon amongst princes, the army, which was the means of the acquisition of Fortune, and thus resembled the milk ocean'. A still more artificial representation of the simile is found in the *prāśasti* of the Rathor king Govinda II, verse 4, belonging to the beginning of the ninth century. I have explained it fully in the translation of the passage.

In the face of these facts, it cannot be doubted that the author of the Nāgī inscription intended to say or to hint all that is contained in the explanation given above.<sup>12</sup>

11. *Coll. Ind. Ind. As.* p. 203, line 7.

12. It is not possible that he had in view even other less important qualities of the mountains named here. Thus as the Meru is the home of the abodes of the gods and as *śānta* also means a wise man, the comparison of the king with the Meru may imply a compliment to the effect that the king was surrounded by wise counsellors and learned men. Cf. for instance *Pañcatantra* p. 14, line 1: *Meruḥ śānta-śānti-dāyakaḥ*.

and when we see that he dares to express himself in such an extra-ordinarily concise manner and is content with only alluding to the *vata* of the three mountains, we cannot but suppose that, in the first place, he knew all the myths in question and, in the second place the comparisons of kings with these mountains were in vogue then, for otherwise the expression in question would have been quite unintelligible to the hearer. The comparisons involved in the epithets in the next lines 54 are some of them so familiar that it is not necessary to demonstrate their occurrence in the *kāvya*. Thus is the case, for instance, with the phrase *l-ava-a-lava-cibedhita-kamala-rimala-indira-radana*, 'whose face resembles a spotless lotus which the sun's rays have awakened from the nocturnal sleep', on which we should only remark that the use of the word *kava*, which also means 'head', is not unintentional. Equally commonplace is the comparison in *patipuna-rada-madala-saravika-pira-ramana*, 'whose appearance is lovely and lustrous like the full moon'. But as the face has been spoken of before, the author uses *adana* for *valana* and thus varies somewhat the usual idea. Lastly, no examples are necessary for *cara-mana-rakara-ratna-rakama*, whose gait is beautiful like that of a lordly elephant, and *bhujagapati-bho-a-pina-ra-a-cupa-ti-bha-nara-bhujaya* 'whose arms strong, round, massive, long and beautiful like the coils of the prince of serpents'. With regard to the last epithet it must be observed, in the meanwhile, that the author has taken great troubles to give a new unusual form to the old comparison of the arm of a warrior with a serpent, already very usual in the epics. For the purpose, he mentions the serpent-prince Nesa instead of some other favourite serpent and piles together a number of adjectives. The first of these things is often done by court poets, e.g., in the *Raghuvamśa*, XIV. 51, Kalidasa describes Kāma as



*asita-janaya prastāyita go-tha-bandhavan* = arrays *raṣṭhāṇām*  
*prastāde o dhana matam dhaurajah sahasakaram agantir* =  
*vidagdhāṇām*.

Of course Bana's expressions are much more choice and they show a considerable advance in the development of the style. Nevertheless, certain similarity is unmistakable and the reason why simpler epithets are inserted in the midst of more compound ones is no doubt the same in both the cases. In line 2, we meet with two long compounds which compare Satakarni with the heroes of the *Mahabharata* as well as with the kings of yore described in that work—'Whose bravery was similar to that of Rama, Haladhir, Kesava, Arjuna and Bhimasena, and whose lustre resembled that of Nabhiṣa, Nahusa, Janamejaya, Śamkara,<sup>15</sup> Yayati, Rama [of the Raghu race], and Ambarasa. Further, these two compounds are separated, certainly not without intention, by another epithet inserted between them. Comparisons with the kings of epic tales are as a rule used by Subandhu and Bana, in the descriptions of their heroes who, however, work out in a further way. They bring out the similarity in particular points by means of a *śloka* on every name or show that their heroes surpass by far the old heroes, in that they go more deeply into the original.<sup>16</sup> Here, in our inscriptions, we have to do with the beginnings of a development which reached its high point certainly in the seventh century, or perhaps even much earlier.

To the great significance of the immediately following passage, I have already alluded (*Nāga-sahasakavanta* of

<sup>15</sup> [Sagara.—DCS.]

<sup>16</sup> Cf. for instance *Udayaditya* p. 1, p. 27 line 1, p. 27 line 3, p. 122 lines 4-5 and especially the passage from the *Harivarana* referred to by Carter et. *Warner Zuehlke* 1st *Kumar* des *Méjendres* Vol. I, p. 126.



*Pañcāṅga* pp. 45 ff. 'who standing in the forefront defeated the hosts of his enemies, in a battle in which, in a manner immeasurable, eternal, incomprehensible and marvellous, the wind, Garuda, the Siddhas, Yaksas, Raksasas, Vidvataras, Bhūtas, Gandharvas, Carakas, the sun, the moon, stars and planets took part.'<sup>11</sup> It is just the oldest instance of a mixture of history and mythology, so usual in the later court poets. As Bilhana repeatedly makes Śiva to interfere in the fortunes of his patron, Vikramāditya, or as Hemacandra surrounds his master Jayasimha Siddhārtha with supernatural beings, or as Padmagupta Pañchalī reduces the history of the life of Siddhārtha<sup>12</sup> to a pure myth, so has here our author, even heavenly powers as confederates to the father of his master. This passage thus provides us with an interesting point of connection between our inscription and the style of narration of the court poets. About the meaning of the next phrase unfortunately we are not sure, as the first letter can be read as *na* or *ṇa*. If we read *ṇagavara-khaṇḍa-  
agantanta* *abhi-  
adha*, as is most probably the case, then it would be rendered thus—'who towered up higher in heaven than the shoulder of a great mountain, or the trunk of a grand tree.'<sup>13</sup> With this we may compare the *Rajatarāṅga*, XVIII, 16, where it is said of king Pāriyātra—

*l-  
vath-  
masta-  
ṇa-  
l-  
am-  
am*

*Lakṣmīḥ sṛje kila Pāriyātram||*

11. H. H. Sankar and Bhupendralal Seal translate *na* as 'which I have  
never witnessed as in which took part by witnessed'. The *na* is  
the I cannot follow this meaning is that no examples of this meaning  
are given by the Sanskrit scholars are known to me. On the contrary  
in *Pañcāṅga* 'fought a battle' is given in the Petersburg Lexicon  
18. 18 edhara. 1208.

12. The *na* in the context here as is often the case in Sanskrit. But  
the Positive *l-  
am* has the sense of the Comparative.

'Fortune resorted, indeed, to [king] Parivatra the height of whose head surpassed [the mountain] Parivatra.

If, on the other hand, we read *nagacakra-kadha*, then we must translate 'who went up into the heaven from the shoulder of his lordly elephant.' The meaning then would correspond to that of verse 20 in the *Lakṣmī-māṇḍalī-pravṛtti*,<sup>2</sup> where it is said of Candragupta 'the consort of the prince Isvara of Samhagara—

*bharatā-gatavati nāgān-āśritaḥ — ut-āśat*

'As her husband ascended to heaven from the shoulder of his elephant.....'

These words describe Candragupta's death, and would mean that he fell from an elephant, and had his neck broken, or that he, while fighting on elephant-back in the battle, met with a hero's death, or perhaps that he exchanged the splendour of the earthly life of a prince for heaven. The second alternative seems to be the most probable. At any rate, the passage referring to Satakirita will have to be understood thus, in case the reading *nāg* is the correct one.

In the remaining lines, we have first the praise of queen Gautamī-Bharatī, 'who, in every way, acted as worthy of her title "the wife of a royal sage";' secondly, the very bold, though improper, comparison of the mountain *Uttarāṣṭra* with a peak of the *Kailāsa* mountain, and lastly the assurance that the cave possessed a magnificence which equalled that of a lordly palace of the gods. All these three notions are most usual in the *lāṅkā*. Instances of the third have been already mentioned by us above.

What we have said so far should quite suffice to prove that the Nāg inscription No. 13, *ibid.* bears a close

20. *Ep. Ind.* p. 13. [*Lakṣmī-māṇḍalī-pravṛtti* *ibid.* Vol. I p. 11).—D.C.S.]

relationship with the *ca-vā-kā-ya* preserved for us, and that it especially contains many comparisons current in the latter. It must, however, be repeated that this *prastāva* occupies a considerably lower rank than the prose parts in Harisena's *āgama*, and is still less artificial than the works of Subandhu, Bana and Dandin.

## VI

### *Conclusion and their Bearing on the Theory of Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature*

Now we propose to sum up the results following from the detailed examination carried on so far. In the second century of our era, there existed *śāstraśāstra* which resembled the Classical samples of the same, not only in respect of the fundamental principles, but in many details also. Like the rhetoricians and writers of the fourth and the following centuries, the poets of the second century regarded the essence of the *śāstra-kāya* as consisting in the frequent use of *śrī-guṇa-vācī*. Like the later authors they were fond of constructing very long sentences, a thing which depended for the most part, on the length and number of compound words. However, they permitted, to the reader and the hearer, resting pauses between long compounds by inserting shorter words or phrases made up of shorter words, one of which are not unlike those inserted for the same purpose in the Classical samples of works written in actual prose. Of the *śāstraśāstra*, the poets make use of the *Adhivācī*, *Upanā*, *Upreśa*, and *Upana*, and at any rate, an attempt at *śrī-guṇa*. As compared with what we find in the Classical works, the figures of speech are in the first place used much more rarely and in the second place, are executed with much less care and skill. Sometimes these rise not at all, or only very little, above the level of what is found in the epics. So also we are

reminded of the language of the epics by the several grammatical forms which are used by the author of the *pragati* of the Śatavahana lake. On the other hand, the arbitrary intermixture of history with mythology found in the Nasik *pragati* just corresponds to a tendency which a much later *lagna*, comes to view very strongly.<sup>1</sup>

Side by side with works written in high prose, there existed, as is to be expected, and as is distinctly shown by the Guntur *pragati*, metrical works whose form essentially agreed with the rules laid down, in the oldest available manuals for the Vaidarbha style. Further, this accordance with rules naturally points to the existence of an *Alankāra-śāstra* or some theory of the poetic art. Both these kinds of composition were equally esteemed with the Brahmanic science, at the courts of Indian princes and in spite of the lacunae in the Guntur inscriptions, it is hardly to be doubted that a personal occupation with poetry is ascribed to the king and Great Satrap Rudradaman, the grandson of a non-Aryan\* governor of an Indo-Scythian ruler. Be this right or not, it is in any case quite evident that the poetry, resembling the Classical *lagna* in essential features, enjoyed royal favour in the second century, as it did

---

1 According to my view what the two inscriptions present must be looked upon as the minimum of the development of poetry at that time and not as the maximum. It appears to me very probable that in the second century there had been many superior and more elaborate compositions because the author of the Guntur inscription was only an obscure provincial writer and the author of the Nasik inscription was only a court poet of the Andhra king. It is, however, very questionable whether the poetic art had reached in Southern India that degree of development which it had reached at the special centres of intellectual life in Northern India. It would be a strange change indeed if the two inscriptions presented to us a completely accurate picture of the stage of development in which Indian poetry was at that time.

\* [Non-Indian.—DCS.]

in later times and that it was cultivated at the Indian courts. In no case can it be said that the Brāhmanic science and literature were extinguished by the invasions and the rule of the barbarian foreigners (as an Indian would say). If we suppose that the *prāsaṅga* informs us of pure historical truth, then its contents clearly show that the life of literature in the second century must have attained to such a richness and strength as to win over to itself even the descendants of barbarians. Thus it naturally follows that the *kāvya* could not have been a new discovery in the second century, but it must have had a long previous history which went back to the times when Aryan princes were the exclusive rulers of India. For this reason, it would not be certainly going too far to assert that the *corrupt prāsaṅga* makes probable the existence of the *kāvya* style, even in the first century.

A very large number of *prāsaṅgas* go to prove that in the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries, the *kāvya* literature was in its full bloom and that the *kāvya* did not at all differ from those handed down to us. The second independent Gupta king whose reign, no doubt, covered the greatest part of the second half of the fourth century, Samudragupta-Pratīkramāṅkya, was himself a poet, and received from his admirers the title *Kaviśāra*. He supported several poets, who at the same time were Pandits, and put on foot, as far as he could, to the old antagonism between the Muses and Plutus. His courtiers followed the example of their master, and the panegyric by Harṣena, 'the minister of foreign affairs and the counselor of the prince royal,' shows that Samudragupta had at least one poet, of whom he had no reason to be ashamed.

Hence *prāsaṅga* is in every respect an artistically finished

\* (*Kaviśāra* may be an *Amara* enjoying the status of a *Amāra*—D.C.S.]



little work, which places its author in a line with Kalidasa and Dandin. Its style is that of the Vaidarbha School. The very fact that Harisena himself belonged to the north-east of India shows that, there must have preceded his time a period of literature, during which, poets from Berar in the Northern Deccan, accomplished much, and brought their particular taste to a high repute. Probably this full bloom of the Vaidarbhas will fall in the third century, or at the latest in the beginning of the fourth century. Under Samudragupta's successor, Candragupta II Vikramaditya, poetry must have similarly enjoyed the patronage of the court, inasmuch as even the king's minister took to himself cleverness in versifying, if not a real poetic talent as such. Even this little composition is written in the style of the Vaidarbha School. The same holds good of the *praiśita* of the time of Kumaragupta and Skandagupta. The works in existence are, however, most insignificant, a phenomenon which is satisfactorily explained by the fact that they were all written by provincial writers. In the second half of the fourth century, in Vatabhāṭṭa's *praiśita* of the Sun temple at Darpur-Mandator, we see traces of the existence of the School of the Gaudas, the poets of eastern India. This work should be called rather the exercise of a scholar who busied himself with the study of the *kāvya* literature, than the product of an actual poet. We can see therein that its author studied the *Śāstra*, and Rhetorics but that, in spite of all the troubles he took to produce a real *kāvya*, he possessed little of inborn talent. Small offences against good taste such as the use of expletives and tautologous words, are more frequently met with. In one place, the author is led to forget one of the most elementary rules of Grammar, by the exigencies of the metre. In another place, in his zeal to form long compounds, he is tempted to disregard the rule, always observed by good writers, according to which the weak pause can never come at the

end of a half verse. In a third place, he jumbles together two ideas in a manner the least permissible, and his attempt to bring out a new comparison between the clouds and the houses leads in no way to a happy result.

These defects in Vatsybhāṭṭi's *prāsaṅgi* make it the more important to the historian of literature, inasmuch as they bear testimony to the fact that everything worthy of attention, in the *prāsaṅgi*, is gathered from the literature of his time and compiled into a whole. Thus, on the one hand, we are assured of the fact that about the year 472 A.D., there was a rich *lāṅkā* literature in existence, and on the other hand, greater weight is gained by the points of accordance with the works handed down to us, which the *prāsaṅgi* presents. It has been already pointed out above that verse 10 of the *prāsaṅgi* only repeats, for the most part, the comparison contained in verse 65 of the *Meghadūta*, with some new points added in a very forced way, while the remaining points contained in that verse of Kālidāsa, find themselves repeated in verse 12 of the *prāsaṅgi*. Further, it is to be noted that Vatsybhāṭṭi, like Kālidāsa, shows a special predilection for the word *subhaga*, and that he, while describing King Bindhuvarman, plays upon his name just in the same way as Kālidāsa does with the names of the Raghus, whom he describes at the beginning of Sarga XVII of the *Raghuvamśa*. These facts make the conjecture more probable that Vatsybhāṭṭi knew and made use of the works of Kālidāsa. The same view is advocated by Kiehnorn in a publication<sup>1</sup> just appearing, which reached me after this treatise was nearly finished. He reads in verse 64 of the *prāsaṅgi*

ramā-anātha-śhṛīraṇa-śatara-śhāśkarā-śhāś-  
vahnī-pratāpa-subhage

<sup>1</sup> The Mandalay inscription of the Malaya year 529 (472 A.D.) and Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa* (N. A. G. H.—D. C. S.) Göttingen 1890 pp. 251 ff.



instead of 'bhāṣane dāra', and shows that the verse sufficiently agrees with the *Rtusamhāra*, V. 23, in both words and thoughts, as there are only two new points added. Although I am not in a position, without examining a good impression of the inscription, to give a definite opinion regarding the proposed, and no doubt very interesting, alteration of the text, still the truth of his assertion that verse 31 of the *Pravāṇi* is an imitation of the *Rtusamhāra*, V. 23, appears to me quite undeniable. If we may believe in the tradition<sup>3</sup> which ascribes the *Rtusamhāra* to the author of the *Merchants*, then the point overlooked by me, which Kielhorn has made out, strengthens the probability of the supposition that Kāśidāsa lived before 472 A.D., which is very significant. In that case, however, it will have to be assumed that Vatsalāhara knew the *Rtusamhāra* also.

One of these conclusions,—the statement that the Indian artificial poetry had developed itself not after, but before the beginning of our era,—is confirmed also by references in a literary work which is by all means old. Whosoever goes through the collection of poetic citations from the *Mahābhārata*, which Kielhorn has brought together in *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XIV, pp. 326 ff., cannot but see that the *Amṛta* prospered in Patañjali's time. Many of the verses exhibit metres characteristic of the artificial poetry, such as *Māhātī*, *Pravṛttakavāṇī*, *Prakṛṣṭa* and *Paṇṭatāṭāṭā*. These

3. This tradition is, at any rate, older than Vallabhadēva's *Subhāṣita*, which belongs probably to the first half of the 11th century. In it are quoted two verses from the *Rtusamhāra*, No. 1674 (= *Ras*, VI 17) and No. 1678 (= *Ras*, VI 20) under the name *Kaśidāsa*. In the note to the first of these the editor wrongly attribute it to the *Amṛtasamhāra*, VI 17. The mistake has been rather due to a misprint. Two other verses from the *Rtusamhāra* have been cited in the same anthology, but without a mention of the particular author. Vallabha has probably taken them from some older work on which the author's name was not given.

verses as well as many others<sup>4</sup> in the heroic *Anuṣṭubh Śloka* agree, in point of contents as well as the mode of expressions, not with epic works, but with the court *katya*. The composition of the *Mahabhāṣya* can now indeed no longer be placed with certainty in the middle of the second century before Christ, as was the case generally up till very recently, because the uncertainty of the known arguments of Goldstucker and others has become more and more evident with the time.<sup>5</sup> In the meanwhile according to what Kielhorn in his article,<sup>6</sup> The Grammarian Pāṇini, has said about the relation of Bhartṛhari and the *kāvya* to the *Mahabhāṣya*, and for reasons of language and style, we cannot establish for Pāṇini a later *terminus ad quem* than something like the first century after Christ. Thus the passages from Pāṇini show at any rate, as Kielhorn remarks in *Ind. Ant.*, loc. citato, 'that the so-called Classical poetry is older than it has lately been represented to be'. A further proof for the early growth of the Sanskrit *kāvya* is provided by a Buddhist work, the *Buddhacarita* of Aśvaghoṣa, whose Chinese translation was prepared between 144 and 141 A.D. The work is not a *mahākāvya* in name only, but is written in the *kāvya* style, as we may judge

4. In this connection one should notice the citations from Vol. I pp. 42, 43; Vol. II p. 119; Vol. III pp. 141, 148 (Kielhorn's edition of the *Bhāṣya*).

5. According to the communication of Prof. N. Bhaskarācārya, The Age of Pāṇini, *Adyar Series*, No. 1, p. 4, the two old Mss. from the South are unfavourable to one historically important word not entered in new dictionaries as they do not read *Maṇṇin* but *manin* in the well-known passage on Pāṇ. V. 3.89. Although the meaning mentioned above contains very little else that is noteworthy, still this point requires to be investigated further especially as Southern Mss. have not been available for the *Bhāṣya* up till now.

6. *Nachrichten der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Göttingen*, 1885, pp. 185 ff.



from the simplex given by Bhandari.<sup>6</sup> Beal, the translator of the Chinese version, looks upon the Buddhist tradition as right.<sup>7</sup> According to this, the author, Asvaghosa, was a contemporary of Kaniska (74 A.D.). Even if we lay aside this difficult question and take our stand on the date of its translation, which is beyond doubt, the work would still possess great worth from the point of view of the history of literature. The composition of the work in question cannot be placed in any case later than 400 A.D. Even the bare fact that a Buddhist monk, as early as this, thought of writing the legend of the Buddha according to the rules of the poetic art, establishes a great popularity of the Brāhminical artificial poetry and confirms the conclusions, arrived at above, by the analysis of Harisena's *prasaṅga*. A thorough examination of the *Buddhavarṇana* and a comparison of its style with that of other *Ālamban* and with the rules of the oldest manual of Rhetoric will, without doubt, lead to more definite and more important results.\*

If one compares the conclusions set forth in this essay with the views of other Sanskritists regarding the history of Indian *Ālamban*, it will be found that they are entirely incompatible, especially with those which Max Müller has worked out in his famous dissertation<sup>8</sup> on the *Re-*

6 *Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit MSS.* p. 82.

\* *Sanskrit History of the East* Vol. XIX pp. xxx-ll.

\* A number of stanzas in the Classical metres and in the *śloka* style are found in inscriptions belonging to the age of the Sakas of Mathura about the beginning of the first century A.D. Cf. *Asiatic Researches* Vol. I (1865) p. 122; cf. p. 187. *Ep. Ind.* Vol. II p. 200. No. 7—DCS.]

8 *Indes ant. et mod. arch. et hist.* pp. 261 ff. On the other hand Lassen's views regarding the development of *Ālamban* come pretty near to the results given above. As he had studied the inscriptions it was but natural that the significance of the earliest inscription and of Harisena's *prasaṅga* did not escape his discerning eye. *Indes ant. et mod. arch. et hist.* Part II. pp. 1159 f., 1169 f.



naissance of Sanskrit Literature and thus I am not, in this case, in a position to agree with the literary-historical supposition of my honoured friend and to build further on the same as I have done many times on other occasions. His first proposition that the Indians did not show any literary activity during the first and second centuries of our era, in consequence of the inroads of the different foreign races, is contradicted by the clear proof provided by the *prashasti* of the Salyasina lake and the Nasik inscription No. 10. I think, I must further add that the extinction of the intellectual life of the Indians during the said two centuries by the Scythians and other foreigners is impossible for other reasons also. In the first place, never had the foreigners brought under their sway, in the long run, more than a fifth part of India. To the east of the district of Mathurā, no sure indications of their rule have been found and the reports of the Greeks ascribe to the Indo-Scythian kingdom no further extent in the east or south. In India proper, the kingdom could permanently possess only the Punjab, besides the high valleys of the Himalaya, the extreme west of North Western Provinces, Eastern Rajasthan, Central India Agency, with Gwalior and Malwa, Gujarat with Kathiawar, as well as Sind. No doubt temporarily these limits are further extended in several cases, as the inscriptions from the reign of Nahapana prove for the western border of the Deccan and several traces of war might present themselves in further removed districts. The rulers of such a kingdom could indeed have exerted a considerable influence on the east of India, but they would never have been able to suppress the literary and scientific life of the Indians. Secondly, however, — and this is the most important point — the very will to show a hostile attitude towards the Indian culture was wanting in the foreign kings of the time, as the sayings and authentic documents inform us. They themselves at



well as their conquerors of the same race were far inferior to the Indians in point of civilisation and culture, and the natural result was that they could not escape the influence of the Indian civilisation, but were themselves Hinduised. Their willingness to appropriate the culture of their subjects is shown by the very fact that the descendants or successors of the foreign conquerors immediately began to bear Indian names, even in the second generation. Huviska's successor is indeed a Śaka, but he is named Vasudeva. Nadejona's daughter is named Dikamitra and his son-in-law, the son of Dmika, a Śaka, is named Uṣavadāta or Uśabhadatta, i.e., Uśabhadatta. The son of Uśatana is Jayadaman. The names of the kings to the Indian systems of religion—equally indisputable. According to the Buddhist tradition, Kaniska is one of the greatest patrons of Buddhism and even became a Buddhist himself. The latter fact is indeed shown to be undeniable by the inscriptions on his coins. On the other hand, there is no doubt that he built a *stūpa* and a *chāra* at Purocapitva-Peshawar. So also it is proved from the inscriptions that Huviska had founded a *chāra* at Mathurā.<sup>10</sup> Uśavadāta and his consort, according to the Nasik and Kettle inscriptions,<sup>11</sup> made grants to Buddhists and Brahmins without distinction, and the former put like a pious Hindu carried out numerous works of public utility for the sake of merit. The Mathurā inscriptions further show that under Kaniska and his successors, by the side of Buddhism, many other systems of religion, like Jainism, were not only tolerated, but enjoyed a high prosperity. These inscriptions as well as numerous archaeological findings prove that the material Indian architecture and sculptures at Mathurā were of a high level, and one of the newest discoveries of Fohrer

<sup>10</sup> Cunningham, *Arch. Surv. Ind.* Vol. III, Plate XIV, No. 2.  
<sup>11</sup> *Arch. Surv. Ind. Rec. Vol. I*, Vol. IV, pp. 361-2.



*pravasti*. These leave no doubt about the fact that there were not one but several such periods of the *Flora* of the *lagna*, of which one fell before the time of Samudragupta, and that they also make it probable that Kalidasa wrote before 472 A.D. The same conclusion is favoured by the fact that Fergusson's bold chronological combinations, on which is based the theory of the Indian Renaissance in the sixth century, have been shown to be unsupported by the researches of Fleet. The authentic documents going down to the year 550 A.D. know absolutely nothing about the Vikramāditya of Ujjain whose existence is inferred or set up by new interpretations of the different legends, and who is reported to have driven away the Scythians from India and to have founded the Vikrama era in the year 544 A.D., dating it as far backwards as 600 years. On the contrary, they prove the following facts concerning Western India, Samudragupta Parakramāñka, according to Fleet's inscription No. II, extended the kingdom of his father, at any rate as far as Uru in the Central Provinces. His son Candragupta II Vikramaditya, according to No. III, conquered Malwā before or in the year 400 A.D. and also possessed Mathurā. Candragupta's son, Kumaragupta I Mahendraditya, held fast these possessions, because, according to No. XVIII, he was the suzerain of the rulers of Dāsapūra Mandasor, in the year 457 A.D. His son, Skandagupta Kramaditya or Vikramaditya according to No. XIV, ruled over Guptāt and Kithāwā, about 455-57 or 456-58 A.D. In his time, the Hunas came forth, against whom he made a successful stand, according to No. XIII. Later on, however, whether it was in his own reign which lasted at least till the year 465 or 468 A.D., or under his successors, Purugupta and Narasimhagupta,<sup>12</sup> the western-

<sup>12</sup> See *Hosmer Journ. Ind.* 45, 56c. Vol. LVIII, p. 80 and *Fleet Ind. An.* Vol. XIX, p. 224. Read *Purugupta* for *Purugupta* (D.C.S.)

most possessions were lost and went over to the foreign race. In Nos. XXXVI and XXXVII, there appear the kings, Toramāna and Mihirakula<sup>13</sup> as rulers of Eria and Gwator, and in No. XXXVII the latter is said to have reigned for fifteen years. The end of the rule of Mihirakula in these districts is quite known to us through Nos. XXXIII, XXXIV and XXXV, according to which he was defeated by king Yasodharman-Vishuvardhana before the year 56 A.D. These inscriptions represent Yasodharman as a very powerful ruler who had brought under his sway not only Western India from Dasapura-Mandasar down to the ocean, but also large parts in the east and north.<sup>14</sup> In his possessions, Mâlwa was naturally included, whose capital Ujjain lies only something like 70 English miles to the south of Dasapura. In No. XXXV, and in the two considerably early inscriptions, Nos. XVII and XVIII, the Malava era is used, which is identical with the so-called Vikrama era beginning with 56-57 B.C.<sup>15</sup> These exceedingly important discoveries, which we owe to Fleet's zeal in collecting data, and his ingenuity prove the absolute untenableness of the Ferussacian hypothesis. Because they shew—(1) that the era of 56-57 B.C. was not founded in the sixth century, but was then in use under the name of the Malava era for more than a century,<sup>16</sup> (2) that at that time, no Sakas

13. See also Fleet's notice on Mihirakula *Ibid.* t. IV, Vol. XV, pp. 242 ff. and on Toramāna *Ibid.* Vol. XVII, p. 325. With regard to *op.* p. 36, note 7, I hold that Visuvardhana is a second name of Yasodharman, as is shown by the grammatical construction.

14. [The king's claim of conquest of India is conventional and not historical.—D.C.S.]

15. See *op.* *Ibid.* t. IV, Vol. XV, pp. 184 ff. and Vol. XIX, p. 50, in which latter place Keith has given the right explanation of the difficult expression *Malavāmanvā* or *Malavakarmāna*. (The Vikrama era begins from 58-57 B.C.—D.C.S.)

16. As a quite clear the Malava era has suffered the same fate as the Śaka era and came to be known by another name since its



could have been driven from Western India, inasmuch as the country had been conquered by the Gaupas more than a hundred years ago — so that on the contrary, other foreign conquerors, the Huns, were driven out<sup>17</sup> of Western India in the first half of the sixth century not, however, by a Vikramāditya, but by Yasodharmas-Vishuvardhana, and (4) that, therefore, there is no room at all in the sixth century for a powerful Vikramāditya of Ujjain, whose exploit called forth a national upheaval in India.

Thus, when, with the fall of the Vikramāditya set up by Fergusson, it becomes no longer possible to place in the sixth century, on the same ground, the writers whom legends connect with a Vikramāditya, the view which holds that the leaders of the Indian poetic art belonged to this period, will be also compelled to support itself by other arguments and to produce a proof for every one of these writers in particular. What has been advanced, in this connection, about Kalidasa in whose name we are interested here — is, in my opinion, not sufficient to make out even the bare probability of such a tenure of the age. The well-known but hardly accredited verse<sup>18</sup> which

---

origin was forgotten. The centre of some speculations the Kanakya inscription (*Ind. Ant. Soc. XIX*, pp. 45 ff.) Apart from the two doubtful documents the oldest known Vikramādiya inscription found in Hirtzsch's *Thesaur. inscriptionum* and corresponding to the 16th April 347 A.D. as Kuchner has shown (*Ind. Ant. Soc. XIX*, p. 35).

17. It does not seem any more necessary that the Huns had caused an interruption in the literary activity of India. I bring to remembrance the fact that both the inscriptions of the age of Isanadatta and Mihirakula contain no mean composition and that their authors glorify the foreign kings as highly as if they had been national rulers.

18. I purposely speak of the verse only. For, in my opinion, it is not advisable to refer to the Gya inscription translated by Ch. Wilkins (40 *Rec. Asiat. Ind.* p. 284) but now lost as a proof for the existence

mentioned Kālidāsa as one of the nine jewels at the court of Vikramāditya, and which makes him a contemporary of the astronomer Varāhamihira, loses all its value. Vikramāditya referred to in the verse is, as the *Jyotirvidyā-kāraṇa* shows, the legendary founder of the era of 56-57 B.C. So long as the history of Western India was absolutely unknown, it was at least possible to conjecture that the writers named in the verse would have been contemporaries and lived under a Vikramāditya whose time was wrongly put later, and that their actual age ought to have been inferred from the sure date of Varāhamihira. But now when we know that in the first half of the sixth century, there never existed a Vikramāditya of Ujjain, it naturally follows that the legend is the more defective. It would be more than a venture to hold as historically true what remains of the legend, namely, the simultaneity of the nine writers.

A second argument \* which is based on Mallinātha's explanation of the *Meḍātala*, verse 14, can also hold little water, in that it requires us to assume many things, no doubt possible, but incapable of proof, and its conclusion opposed by important considerations. One must, to begin with, take it as proved that Mallinātha was right in asserting that, in the passage in question, Kālidāsa, in the word *atira mān* referred to a hated opponent, further that this opponent is identical with the Buddhist teacher Dharmakīrti, so also, that this latter was the pupil of

---

of a tradition of the Nine Jewels. Whosoever compares the translation (cf. Murphy's *Jewels in Portuguese*) of the Coimbatore inscription by the same learned gentleman with the original will certainly agree with me in that his word is not sufficient to afford us the certainty that the Coimbatore inscription contained such a striking statement as that of the Nine Jewels.

*U. Indr. var. can it teach us* pp. 304 ff.

Vasubandhu or Asanga<sup>20</sup> as the Buddhist tradition goes according to Taranātha and Ratnadharmasila. Then comes the last and the most questionable link in the chain, i.e., the assigning of the year 300 or 2 to the two brothers Vasubandhu and Asanga, which derives its main support from the untenable theory of the great Vikramaditya of the sixth century. This assumption, as Max Müller himself admits, is contradicted by a Chinese account, according to which, Kumārajīva translated the works of Vasubandhu in the year 404 A.D. The same is further contradicted by Bunyiu Nanpo, that the same Kumārajīva translated the life of Vasubandhu, as well as in my opinion by the existence of Chinese translations of Vasubandhu's works in the years 506, 509, 509-11 (Bunyiu Nanpo, *Catalogue* Nos. 1168, 1194, 1233).<sup>21</sup>

A third argument<sup>22</sup> which is based on the assumption that Kalidasa must have lived after Aryabhatya who wrote about 499 A.D., just because he shows acquaintance with the scientific astronomical borrowed from the Greeks, has fallen down to the ground owing to the result of the newest researches. Max Müller in addition to the views of earlier scholars, held that Aryabhatya was the father of scientific Indian astronomy, and assigned the five Siddhāntas selected by Varahamihira to the sixth century. But this is quite a mistake, according to Habauts thorough examination of the question in the introduction to

20. The two Tibetan writers contradict each other on this point. Taranātha says *He is the brother of Asanga* (p. 10) and Dharmapala says *He is the father of Asanga*. The second account becomes the Ratnadharmasila. The other Chinese writers are not aware of this tradition.

21. Beal according to note 27 to his translation of the *Sūtra* Vol. I, p. 191 appears to have doubted the fact that Vasubandhu lived in the sixth century A.D. (cf. *ibid.* p. 196 note 80) where Beal shows that Vasubandhu according to Hsuen-tsang, lived 'in the middle of 300' during the period 450 B.C. 650 A.D.

22. *India what can it teach us?*, pp. 318 ff.

the edition of the *Pañcatantra*. Of the five Siddhantas two, *Paitanaha* and *Lavasta*, have nothing to do at all with the astronomy borrowed from the Greeks. Of the remaining three, two, *Rashaka* and *Paulina*, are more incomplete and older than the one ascribed to Śīrya, and all the three, in their form, go backwards even before Āryabhaṭa's works. They are also treated by Varāhamihira, with greater respect than Āryabhaṭa and other individual astronomers. These and other considerations lead Thibaut to fix the year 400 A.D. as the *terminus ad quem* for the *Rashaka* and *Paulina*.<sup>21</sup> Thus it is no longer necessary to assign Kālidāsa to the sixth century just on the ground that he is acquainted with Greek astronomy. I must still further add that the assertion made by S. P. Pandit and Max Müller that Kālidāsa in the *Ratnavāṇa*, XIV 10, traced the lunar eclipse to the shadow of the earth, rests on a misunderstanding. Kālidāsa there, speaks of the spots on the moon, which as the Purāṇas teach us, are called into being by a reflection of the earth.<sup>22</sup> As for the eclipse, he is quite orthodox, as is to be expected of an Indian poet.

A fourth argument, on which C. Huth lays some stress in his investigation about Kālidāsa,<sup>23</sup> carried out with much labour, rests on the mention of the Hecates, amongst the

<sup>21</sup> In a recent article on the *Rashaka* & *Paulina* in *J. I. T. C.* Vol. XIX pp. 10-11 S. P. Dikshitar goes still further and fixes the time of Ptolemy, 150 A.D. as the *terminus ad quem* for the elder *Rashaka*. Thibaut also says *loc. cit.* pp. 10-11 that the *Rashaka* can be older than Ptolemy although there lies no concrete ground for this exposition of their connection. He says *loc. cit.* Vol. XIX p. 287.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. for instance *Levatharmottara* I 29 and  
*and hāṭhe narmate pāṭhe vā nā nā kinnā* 16  
*as dāṭhe vāṭhe dāṭhe vāṭhe vāṭhe vāṭhe vāṭhe*  
*nā—vā kinnā vāṭhe vāṭhe vāṭhe vāṭhe vāṭhe*

<sup>23</sup> *Die Geschichte der Kallidasa* pp. 30 ff. (Inaugural Dissertation Berlin, 1880).

frontier peoples of India, in the *Raghuvamśa*, IV, 63. Huth thinks that it can be assumed that Kalidasa transferred the conditions of his time to that of Rāghu, and that by the Hūnas are meant, the White Huns. These possessed Kāśmīra twice, once from the end of the second century B.C. to the end of the second century A.D., and again from the beginning of the fifth to the end of the sixth century. Now as it is impossible on various grounds that Kālidasa should have lived at the time of the first possession, so, Huth further concludes, he must have belonged to the second period and that naturally the sixth century should be the *terminus ad quem*. The information provided by the Gupta inscriptions, regarding the history of the Hūnas in India, would very much modify this conclusion. But it is not at all necessary to go into further details, for there is no difficulty in showing the improbability of the very first proposition in the argument, which has not been proved. Indian poets, even when describing the triumphs of historical kings, their very masters and patrons, are frequently quite inaccurate in their geographical and ethnographical accounts, and instead of giving actual facts, they take their stand on the traditional accounts in the epics, Purāṇas and other older works that describe *dharma*. Thus Vikramī (about 740 A.D.) makes his master and hero, Yasovarman of Kanauj, to conquer the Pārasikas, although the Persian empire was then no longer in existence. Similarly, Bilhana, in the *Vikramānka-gatā*, XVIII, 34, describes Ananta of Kaśmir as conquering the Sikas, and further in 53-57, his son Kalasa is conquering the kingdom of the Amazonas (*śrī-rāya*) after a ride through the ocean of sands, as well as visiting the Kāśya, the Mānasa lake, and Alaka the city of the Yaksas. In the face of these facts it is hard to believe that Kalidasa instead of following as a good fact is supposed to do the



authority of the lists of peoples in the *Mahābhārata* or of the *Bhāṣya-vyāsa* in the Purāṇas, should have occupied himself with the historico-geographical investigations regarding the conditions of the frontier peoples of his time. If we look into his works more carefully, we shall find that they contain much that points to his having made use of the sources mentioned above. The whole of the *dharmadanda* contains no names which are not also mentioned in the Purāṇas on the same or similar occasions. It also mentions side by side with peoples like the Parasikas (verse 60) and Yavanas (verse 61), the Hunas (verse 68) and Kinnaras (verse 69) which can never justly belong to the time of the poet, not even to a single period of time whatsoever. The Greeks have never been simultaneous neighbours with the Persians, and surely the Greeks have never possessed the North-West Frontier of India in years after the birth of Christ.<sup>26</sup> Further, even if the Hunas rushed out of India, through Kābul, and possessed the country, still it is not intelligible how a writer who took his stand on historic facts can mention both the subjugators and the subjugated, side by side, as independent peoples.

As for other so-called arguments for the supposition that Kālidāsa belonged to the sixth century, I pass them over, because they are open to similar and even greater objections than those discussed above. I do not believe that the question of the time of Kālidāsa and of other leaders of Indian poetic art, whose dates have not been fixed by actual historical documents, will make an essential difference, by such methods as have been followed up to now, by most of the Sankhrist. In order to arrive at

<sup>26</sup> If the Greeks of records of the second and third centuries see *Strauss, Sele. Histor. Fragm.* Vol. I, 1905 ed. pp. 1-2, 204, 528. For Greek rule in Eastern India see *Strauss, Sele. Histor. Fragm.* I, *Kamboja and Rajput History*, pp. 52 ff.—DCS.]



certain conclusions, we must thoroughly investigate the language, style and poetical techniques of single works and compare them with those of works whose dates have been known with certainty or with approximate definiteness, and of epigraphical documents, as well as with the canons laid down in the older manuals of poetics. If we will extend the scope of our work to the epics also, we will be able to have quite a complete picture of the gradual growth of Indian poesy. Such investigations of which a beginning has been made, especially in the works of Jacob, naturally fall outside the limit of this essay whose only aim is to point out, in a general way, the significance of the study of inscriptions for the Aryan literature.

## INDEX

- Acchavanta 66n  
 Agastya 21  
 Ahinaga 13  
 Ashole 4  
 Aihole-Meguti inscription 4  
 Ājuna 66n  
 Ākhyāyikā 34  
 Alakā, city 18, 91  
 Alakāra 49, 55, 63, 66, 76 ; *Īstra* 63, 66, 77  
 Allahabad 6 ; *prasthā* 55, 86  
 Ambarīṣa 73  
 Ambu 38  
 Amṛtadatta 38  
 Ānandavardhana 28  
 Ananta 52 and n  
 Andhra 34  
 Antaka 46  
 Anuprāsa 57, 68  
 Anuṣṭubh 11 ; *śloka* 82  
 Apāramēzha 18  
 Aphsāq *prasthā* 70  
 Arjuna 23, 73  
 Arīh-alakāra 58, 60  
 Arthavyakti 62  
 Ārya 47  
 Arya 11-12  
 Āryabhaṭa 91  
 Āryāvara 47  
 Asaṅga 91n  
 Asvaghōṣa 8  
 Atoka 27  
 Asura 23  
 Atvughōṣa 82-83  
 Babylonian record 53n  
 Bactro-Pali 53  
 Baidhāna 61  
 Bālaka-Hari 47  
 Bāṇa, Bāṇa-bhaṭṭa 3-4, 17, 41, 46, 69  
 72-73, 76  
 Bandhuvārman 9, 12-13, 24, 31, 80  
 Beal, S. 83  
 Bendall, C. 83  
 Berar 3, 79  
 Bhadrāyantiya school 63, 67  
 Bhagavānīśi 53n, 54n, 62n  
 Bhandārkar, R. G. 5, 51, 63n  
 Bhānugupta 7  
 Bharata 61n  
 Bhāravi 4  
 Bhartṛhari 82  
 Bhāskara 14  
 Bhāskaraśāstra, N. 82n  
 Bhaṭṭa Dāji 51, 64  
 Bhīmaśena 73  
 Bhīma 7  
 bhūmi 17  
 Bhūta 74  
 Bhuvana-vinyāsa 94  
 Bhuvar 7  
 Būhaṇa 74, 93  
 Būhad 6  
 Brahman 15, 41  
 Brāhmanā 1, 15, 21, 34  
 Bṛhaspati 23, 46  
 Bṛhatsaṃhitā 4, 16, 21  
 Buddhacarita 82-83  
 Buddhagupta 7  
 Burgess 92n  
 Campā 34  
 Candaka brothers 86  
 Candakāśika 3  
 Candā 8  
 Candragupta 11 5-6, 32-33, 40, 42, 75, 87

- Cāraka* 16, 74  
*Caṣṣana* 50, 53, 59, 61, 63, 85  
*Chanda* 49  
*Chattrapa* 53  
 Christian era 1, 2.  
 Citra inscription 90n  
*Citoḍa* 50n  
*clira* 62  
*Cuttiringham, A.* 85n  
*Dadhikarna, Nāga prince* 86  
*Dakṣiṇāpaṭhesara* 67n  
*Dakṣa* 7  
*Dakṣamitrā* 85  
*Daṇḍaka* 43  
*Dandin* 12-13, 23, 40, 57, 61-63, 76, 79  
*Dutakumārcarita* 34  
*Dakṣiṇa* 8-9, 11, 17, 22-23, 31, 88  
*Dakṣiṇa-Mandavor* 9, 77, 87-88  
*Dhanada* 46  
*Dhanyavṇu* 17  
*Dhārā* 49  
*Dholpur inscription* 89  
*Dhruva* 51n  
*Dhruvabhūti* 34  
*Dhruvāśarma* 6  
*Dhanyaloka* 28  
*Diamouna* 50n  
*Dignāga* 90-91  
*digvijaya* 93-94  
*Dikṣit, S. P.* 5, 92  
*Dinika* 85  
*Drutavilambita* 11  
*Dvārakā* 20  
*Frän* 7, 87, 88  
*Fergusson* 87, 89  
*Fleet, J. F.* 1-2, 5-6, 10, 13, 25, 29, 31, 33, 35, 40, 46, 87  
*gadya-kavya* 55, 67, 76  
*gadya-padya* 60-61  
*Ganadāsa* 32  
*Gandharva* 15-16, 46, 74  
*Gaṇga* 36-37  
*Gangdhar* 7  
*Garuḍa* 48, 74  
*Gauḍa school* 12, 79, style 70  
*Gauḍavaho* 46  
*Gautami Balāśi* 67, 75  
*Gautamiputra Śātakarṇa* 64, 65n, 67  
*Gaya inscription* 89n, 90n  
*Ghṣāmottika*, 53n  
*Gumār* 34, 50; inscription, *prāsaśi* 50, 54, 56, 63, 67-68, 77 and n, 78, 83, 86  
*Godāvarī, river* 64  
*Goparāja* 7  
*Govardhana district* 65  
*Govinda II, Rāṭhor (Rāṭrakūṭa) king* 70  
*grantha* 7  
*Greeks* 94 and n  
*Gujarat* 9, 17, 34, 52, 84, 87; Northern 52n  
*Guṇādhyā* 4  
*Gupta—dynasty* 2, 4-7, 33, 40, era, year, *mahvat* 5-7, 51 and n, inscriptions 2, 5, 50, 93-94  
*Gwalior* 8, 84, 88  
*Hāla* 4  
*Hara* 214  
*Harśa* 11  
*Harṣena* 6, 8, 33-35, 38-43, 46-48, 57-58, 76, 78, 86; his *prāsaśi* 50, 83  
*Harṣacarita* 3, 17, 34, 46, 70  
*Harṣavardhana* 3, 60  
*Hemacandra* 21, 45, 74  
*Himālaya* 68, 84  
*Himavat* 23  
*Hüeco-tsang* 91n  
*Hoerole* 87n, 88n  
*Hultzsch* 89  
*Hōra* 87, 89 and n, 93-94  
*Huth, G.* 92  
*Huviska* 85  
*India* 2-3, 8, 40; North-Western 53  
*Indian—poet* 23; *kavya* 2

- Indo-Scythian 53-54, 64  
 Indra 35, 46  
*Indravajra* 11  
 Iśānavarman 70  
 Iśvarī, princess 75  
 Jain 2  
 Jamunā 50n  
 Janamejaya 73  
 Jastan pillar inscription 51n  
 jasmine 25, 45  
 Jayadāman 59, 85  
 Jayasīnha Siddharāja 74  
 Junāgaḍh, Junāgaḥ 7  
 Junāgaḥ-Girinagara 50  
 Junnar inscription 64  
*Jyotirvīdābharaṇa* 90  
 Kabul 91-94  
*Kādambari* 13, 34, 69, 72 and n  
 Kaṭaum 7  
 Kailāsa, mountain 22, 37, 75, 93  
 Kalāṭa, 93  
*Kālidāsa* 3-4, 13, 18-20, 22, 27, 32, 41, 44, 71, 79-81, 87, 89-94  
 Kalyāṇī 49  
 Kāma 27-28, 71  
 Kamboja 94  
 Kapaswā inscription 89n  
 Kanauj 1, 40, 46, 49  
 Kanheri 34  
 Kanika 83, 85  
*kanti* 61  
 Karle inscription 64, 85  
 Kashmir 34, 38, 49, 93  
*kathā* 34  
*Kāṭhāwād* 34, 52, 64, 84, 87; Northern 52n  
 Kaulsa Sāha 32  
*Kavirāja* 49, 78  
 Kavi 86  
*Kavya* 3-4, 6, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20-24, 27-29, 31, 33, 39, 44, 46-49, 63, 65, 83, 87; Classical 77; literature 50, 55, 61, 78, 95; Prakrit 66; Sanskrit 66 i style 57, 78, 82  
*Kavyādarśa* 13-14, 23, 40, 61-62  
 Keśava 73  
 Kesavājuna 66  
*Khādyaśāpakika, Khādyakutapākika* 34 and n  
 Khakharāta family 64  
 Kharoṣṭrī, Kharoṣṭrī-lipi 53, 64  
*Khatrapa* 51  
*Khshatrapāvan* 52n  
 Kielhorn I, 80-82, 89n  
 Kinnara 14-15  
*Kirtītarjuniya* 27  
 Koṅkin 64  
 Kōso 49  
 Kṛṣṇaka 39  
 Kṣharāta clan 64  
 Kṣatrapa, Kshatrapa 52-53  
 Kṣemadhanvan 73  
*kulaka* 25  
 Kumāra 34  
*Kumārāgupta* I, 6, 9, 22, 70, 79, 87  
 Kumārājya 91  
*Kumārāndhya* 78 and n  
*Kumāravandhana* 27, 81n  
 Kusāna 94n  
*laghu* 62  
*Lākhāmaṇḍala prasasti* 14, 75 and n  
 Lakṣmī 70  
 Lawa 83  
 Lāṭa 9, 11, 17  
 Liaka Kusulaka 51n  
*Nī-ambuja* 62  
*madhu* 27  
*mādhurya* 61 and n  
 Madra 7  
 Māgha 20  
*Mahābhārata* 73 94  
*Mahābhāṣya* 4, 81, 82  
*mahākāvya* 10-12, 82  
*Mahākṣatrapa* 52, 54, Rudradāman 50  
*Mahārāja* 53-54  
*Mahārājadhiraāja* 35  
*Mahāśabda* 54



- Mahāsāmuntā* 53  
 Mahāvīra-Vardhamāna 2  
 Mahendrapāla I  
 Mahā 52n  
 Mahipāla I  
 Mahatā 81  
 Mālava 7, 17, 25, 45 ; era, satavat,  
 year 6-7, 88 and n ; *ganasthiti* 88n  
*Malavikāgnimitra* 32  
*Mālatī* 11  
 Mallinātha 90  
 Malwa 33, 52, 84, 87-88  
 Mānasa lake 91  
*Mānavadharmasāstra* 47  
*Mandākrāntā* 11, 39  
 Mandara, mountain 69-70  
 Mandasor 7-9 ; inscription of 472  
 A. D. 80n ; *prastā* 87  
 Mathurā 5, 84-87 ; inscription 5, 85  
 Mātṛceya 8  
 Mātṛvīra 7  
 Maukhari dynasty 8  
 Max Müller 83, 86, 91-92  
 Mayūra 15  
 Mayūrāśaka 6  
*Meghadūta* 18, 80-81, 90  
 Meguti temple 4  
 Meherauli pillar inscription 8  
 Mercury 21  
 Meru 70n  
*Meru-Madara-pavata-sama-sāra* 68  
 Mihirakula 8, 88 and n, 89n  
 Moga 53n  
 Mūlarāja 69 and n  
 Muses 78  
 Nābhāga 73  
 Nabhā 13  
 Nāga 16  
 Nāgapana 64, 65 and n, 84-85  
 Nabhā 73  
 Nanon, Bunvin 91  
 Nāṇada 16, 46  
 Nāṇamahagupta 87  
 Narmadā 21  
 Nāsik inscription 64-65, 68, 70, 75,  
 77n, 84-85, *prastā* 77  
 Nasik-Poona region 65n  
*Nāṭyāśāstra* of Bharata 61n  
*Nayasāhasāṅkacarita* 73  
*Nāyika* 16  
 Nine Jewels 90n  
 Nirgrantha 2  
*Nirāśāstra* 72  
*ojas* 61n, 62, 67  
 Okhāmanjāl pillar inscription 51n  
 Ouzegon 66  
 Ozene 50  
*paśa saukunārya* 61n  
 Padmagupta-Parimala 74  
*Pañḍamahāśuddhānta* 92  
 Panthan 63  
 Palāṇi, river 59  
 Pāl 65  
*Pañcāśuddhāntikā* 4, 92  
 Paṇḍit, S. P. 49, 92  
 Panini 82  
 Pārāsika, people 94  
*parāśa* 41  
 Pāriyātra, king 74-75  
 Pāriyātra, mountain 75  
 Pārtha 21  
*Pārasparasāra* 3  
 Pampat 36  
 Pāṭaliputra 32, 40  
 Patañjali 81-82  
*Paulīśasiddhānta* 92  
 Persians 94  
 Peshawar 85  
 Peterson 34  
 Pūṣṭipadraka, village 67  
 Pūṣṭi 78  
*Prabhāvākācarita* 21  
*Prakṛti* 81  
 Praśāpati 46  
 Prakrit 3, 46  
*Pratimāśārā* 81  
*pratāda* 62  
 Pratisthāna 64

- Pravarasena 4  
 Prinsep 38  
 Priti 21  
*Prithvi* 39  
 Ptolemy 50, 56, 63, 65, 92n  
 Pujumāyī 65, 67  
 Puṇḍarikā 13  
 Puragupta 87  
 Purāṇa 15, 92-94  
 Pūrugupta 87n  
 Puruṣapura 85  
 Pūṣan 16  
 Raghu race 13, 73, 93  
*Raghuramāla* 14, 20, 24, 69, 71, 74, 92-93  
*Rājadhiraja* 54  
*Rajan* 52-53  
*Rajaraja* 54  
*Rājalekhara* 1  
*Rajastiraja* 54  
*Rajendrakarṇapūra* 38, 45  
 Rajput 94n  
*Rājputānā* 34 ; Eastern 84  
*Rākṣasa* 74  
*Rāma* 20, 73  
*rasa* 13  
*rasavat* 61  
 Rati 21  
 Ratnadharmarāja 91  
*raudra-rasa* 13  
 Revā, river 21  
*Rkṣavat*, mountain 66 and n  
*Romakasiddhānta* 92  
*Rṣabhadatta* 85  
*Rtuanhāra* of Kālidāsa 26, 80n, 81 and n  
 Rudradāman 34, 51, 54 and n, 59-61, 63-64, 77 ; his inscription 50  
 Rudrasena 51  
 Rudrasimha 51  
*rūpaka* 76  
*Śāba* 32  
*Śābdalaākṛa* 57  
*śabda-samaya* 62 and n  
*ś'abda-Juddhatra* 62n  
 Sagara 73n  
 Sahasya 25  
 Sāhi 83  
 Śaka era 51 and n, 52, 55, 64-65  
*Sakaladakhināpathesara* 67  
*śamādhī* 61n  
*Samadhigutapañcamahāśabda* 54  
*Sāmantā* 53-54  
*samata* 61n  
 Śambhu 32, 38-39  
 Śaṅkara 73  
 Samudragupta 5-6, 8, 33, 35-37, 40-42, 44-47, 49, 60, 87 ; Parākramāśaka 87  
 Śaṅkara 7  
 Sarasvatī 44  
*Ś'ardūlavikrīṣita* 11, 39  
*Śārhagadhara* 26  
*Ś'arhagadharapaddhati* 26, 28, 39  
 Śārāgin 20, 25  
 Śātakarpi 65, 72-73  
 Śātavāhana dynasty 4  
 Satrap 52  
 Saura 15  
 Savitī 15  
 Scythian 84  
 Śeṣa, serpent prince 19-20, 39, 71  
 Shihābuddīn 38  
 Siddha 15-16, 45, 74  
 Siddhānta 91-92  
 Siddharāja 74  
 Sidhapura 75  
 Sind 84  
 Sindhurāja 74n  
*sinduvāra* 27  
 Sircar, D. C. 5, 10, 13, 15, 25, 30, 32n, 34n, 41-42, 94n  
 Siro-Polemos, Siri-Polemos 63  
*Ś'ilupālavadha* 20  
 Śiva 15, 46, 74  
*Si'yu-ki* 91  
 Skandagupta 7, 79 ; Kramāditya, Vikramāditya 87

- Īleṣa* 76  
*sphuṭa* 62  
*Sragdharā* 39  
*Śrī* 44  
*Śrī-Puṣumāyī* 63  
*Śrī-rājya* 93  
*Śrūpa* 85  
*Subandhu* 4, 21, 41, 73, 76  
*Subhāṣirāvalī* 24, 38-39, 81n  
*Sudarśana lake* 50, 54, 65, 77, 84  
*Śodraśa, king* 69, 72  
*Śukra* 23  
*sukumārara* 62  
*Sumeru* 22  
*Suranāḍī* 39  
*Surāṣṭra* 52  
*Sūrya* 92  
*Sūryaśatoka* 15-16  
*Suvarṇasikatā, river* 59  
*Suvilākha* 52  
*Swāmī* 52  
*svayam-adhigata-Mahākṣatrapa-labha(nāman)* 54 and n  
*Tapasya* 27-28, 30  
*Tāranātha* 91 and n  
*Terrien de la Couperie* 53n  
*Thanesar* 3  
*Thibaut* 91  
*Tiastanes, king* 50  
*Tiatoura* 50n  
*Tilabhaṭṭaka* 34  
*tī-samuda-toya-pita-vāhana* 72  
*Tomara clan* 41  
*Toramāṇa* 7, 88, 89n  
*Tripathagā* 37  
*Trirāīmī mountain* 75  
*Tumburu* 46  
*udāra* 62 and n  
*udārata* 61n  
*Udayagiri* 6-7, 32  
*Udepur prāśasti* 72n  
*Ujjain* 49, 52, 87-90  
*Ujjayanta* 50  
*Upajāti* 11  
*upamā* 76  
*Upendravarjra* 11  
*Urjayat, mountain* 50, 59  
*Usabhadāta* 64n, 56n, 85  
*Uṣavadāta, same as Usabhadāta* 85-86  
*utprekṣā* 76  
*Vaidarbha school* 79 : style 77  
*Vaidarbhi* 13, 40-41 ; *riti* 50, 61  
*Vākpati* 46-47, 93  
*Vallabhadeva* 81n  
*Vamśastha* 11  
*Varāhamihira* 2, 16, 21, 90-91  
*Vara-vāraṇa-vikrama-cāru-vikrama* 71  
*varṇ-ānuprāsa* 58  
*Varuṇa* 46  
*Vasantatilakā* 11, 81  
*Vāsavadattā* 21, 34, 70n, 73n  
*Vāsiṣṭha* 92  
*Vasubandhu* 91 and n  
*Vāsudeva* 85  
*Vāsula* 7  
*Vatsabhaṭṭi* 7-15, 17-21, 23, 28-30, 33, 39, 80-81 ; his *prāśasti* 79-80  
*Veda* 21  
*Vedic language* 56  
*Vidarbha* 3  
*vidya* 49  
*Vidyādhara* 74  
*vihāra* 85  
*Vijhachavanta* 66  
*Vikramāditya* 5, 74, 87, 89-90  
*Vikrama era* 8, 87, 88 and n  
*Vikramāṅkacarita* 26, 93  
*Vikramorvaṣīya* 27, 44  
*vimāna* 19-20  
*Vindhya* 21, 23  
*Vindhyaṛkjavat* 66  
*Vīrasena* 6, 32-33  
*Viṣṇu* 8, 15, 20, 41, 47  
*Viṣṇudharmottara* 92n  
*Viṣṇuvardhana* 7, 88  
*Viṣṇuvarman* 6, 9, 23-24  
*Vivaxvat* 16



- |                                   |                                    |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <i>Vyākaraṇa</i> 49               | Yasodharman-Viṣṇuvardhana 7, 88-89 |
| Western—Deccan 64 ; Kṣātrapa 51n  | Yasovarman 8, 46, 93               |
| Yakṣa 74, 93                      | Yavana 94                          |
| Yśāmotika, <i>Mahākṣātrapa</i> 53 | Yayāti 73                          |
| Yasodharman 7, 88                 | Yogin 15-16                        |

## CORRECTION

Page 94, note, line 3.— *Read—Cl. for—Cl.*

## OUR PUBLICATIONS

1. *Indian Feudalism, C. 300-1200* by Prof. R. S. Sharma, 1965, pp. 319. Price Rs. 15.00.
2. *Land System and Feudalism in Ancient India*, edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1966, pp. 140. Price Rs. 7.50.
3. *Paurāṇic and Tāntric Religion* by the late Dr. J. N. Banerjea, 1966, pp. 188. Price Rs. 12.50.
4. *The Śakti Cult and Tārā* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1967, pp. 180 with 9 plates. Price Rs. 10.00.
5. *Kṛiṇa in History and Legend* by the late Dr. B. B. Majumdar, 1969, pp. 307. Price Rs. 20.00.
6. *Bhārata War and Purāṇic Genealogies* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1969, pp. 197. Price Rs. 10.00.
7. *The Bhakti Cult and Ancient Indian Geography* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1970, pp. 225. Price Rs. 12.50.
8. *Foreigners in Ancient India and Lakṣmī and Sarasvatī in Art and Literature* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1970, pp. 192 with 9 plates. Price Rs. 12.00.
9. *Early Indian Indigenous Coins* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1970, pp. 176 with 2 plates. Price Rs. 12.00.
10. *Social Life in Ancient India* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1971, pp. 170. Price Rs. 12.00.
- 11-13. *Journal of Ancient Indian History* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, Vol. I (1967-68), 1968, pp. 346 with 6 plates; Vol. II (1968-69), 1969, pp. 433 with 7 plates; and Vol. III (1969-70), 1970, pp. 450 with 14 plates. Subscription Rs. 20.00 payable in advance; back volumes each Rs. 30.00.
14. D. R. Bhandarkar's *Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1968, pp. 81. Price Rs. 10.00.
15. E. W. Hopkins' *Social Position of the Ruling Caste in Ancient India: The Status of Woman* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1969, pp. 89. Price Rs. 10.00.
16. *Prācyavidyā-taraṅgi* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1969, pp. 540 with 49 plates. Price Rs. 60.00.
17. *Some Problems of Kuṣāṇa and Rājput History* by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1969, pp. 120. Price Rs. 20.00.
18. A. K. Coomaraswamy's *Origin of the Buddha Image* edited by Prof. D. C. Sircar, 1970, pp. 100. Price Rs. 12.00.